

# The Bible Champion

Volume XVIII.

NOVEMBER, 1914.

Number 4

## THE ARENA.

### The Virgin Birth and the Divinity of Jesus

H. W. MAGOUN, PH.D.

#### Second Paper.

As already intimated, this is a difficult and a complex question. For modern thinkers, the trouble seems to begin almost invariably with the doctrine of the Trinity. There are those who find it impossible to understand how there can be a Father, a Son, and a Holy Ghost, while at the same time there is only one divine being. Mohammed had the same difficulty, and he met it by teaching that God is one, Christ being merely a prophet. In other words, he cut the knot which he could not untie. That is what modern Unitarianism does. It gets rid of the difficulty by discarding what it finds hard to understand. Moreover, it then ignores not only the complications but also the disastrous implications which inevitably result.

And yet the doctrine of the Trinity is by no means as impossible as such men have supposed, and it involves no such difficulties as they have assumed. To hold that "intellectual people are Unitarians" is both misleading and untrue. Some intellectual people are Unitarians without any question; but the great majority of them always have been and still are Trinitarians. Great names can be found in the Unitarian ranks; but, almost without exception, it will be discovered that they belong in the class of brilliant thinkers rather than among those who must be classed as profound thinkers. Indeed, it is quite impossible to match such intellects as those of Gladstone and Bismarck, both of whom were Trinitarians, in the Unitarian fold.

If it is urged that these two men had their limitations, nothing is gained thereby; for all men have their limitations, and great men are no exception to the rule. Moreover, as far as that is concerned, it may be said without fear of successful contradiction that Unitarian great men have been

from the beginning rather conspicuous for their limitations. They are apt to be persons in whom the sensibilities are overshadowed by the intellect, or the will,—that does not necessarily imply that they are intellectually superior to other people;—and, for that reason, they cannot be regarded as "well-balanced men." Where exceptions are discovered, it will be found that they always approach, so far as their personal views with regard to Jesus are concerned, as closely as possible to Trinitarian teachings; and there are men of that sort who actually owe their power as preachers to early Trinitarian associations and a Trinitarian training in some orthodox denomination.

Then, too, it seems necessary to admit that the only known source of supply for the Unitarian Church is found in Trinitarian congregations or in students from Trinitarian churches; for Unitarianism plainly grows by means of accretions from the ranks of other churches that are Trinitarian in their beliefs, and many of its shining lights have been brought up in a Trinitarian faith and then gone over to the Unitarian fold. It does not follow that men who have thus apostatized are to be regarded as among the choicest and best of their various denominations, because they have not been. The truth is that they have sought to escape the restrictions imposed upon them by the orthodox churches, along with the tremendous authority assigned to Christ by orthodox believers; and, in some cases, investigation makes it only too evident that self-indulgence has had more to do with the matter than intellectual convictions.

No motive of that kind can ever lead to spiritual power. Moreover, the absence of such power in the average Unitarian needs



no advertisement. Indeed, Unitarians often realize more or less clearly that Trinitarians have something which they do not possess, and they are puzzled by the fact. They wonder what it can be, and occasionally they even ask some Trinitarian for information along that line. As it is impossible to give it without starting a controversy, the one who is thus approached is forced to remain silent. He cannot, for obvious reasons, supply the desired information, however much he may feel inclined to do so. Trinitarians who are aware of these things cannot repress a smile, and some of them find it hard to abstain from ridicule, when they read Unitarian tracts so written as plainly to indicate that the propagandists of that persuasion are endeavoring to catch unwary Trinitarian youths with the bait of an assumed intellectual superiority, which is as bumptious as it is unwarranted.

The whole trouble lies in the unwillingness—or inability—to differentiate a trinity from a triad. A trinity is a threefold unit, a single complex entity containing three distinct elements. A triad is three different units. The human mind is a trinity; for it consists of an intellect, a sensibility, and a will. Each has its own functions to perform, and yet each is indissolubly bound up with the other two. Each must have equal force, or development, in a normal individual; and, if a person has any one of the three so constituted that it overbalances the others, that man or woman is not a normal specimen of the race. The judgment of such an individual is never reliable, for the simple reason that it is warped by his one-sided development. No other result is possible, and no other need be looked for.

A preponderance of intellect leads to coldness, lack of sympathy, and a tendency to be erratic. Sensibilities in the ascendancy produce instability and sentimentalism; and good material for a mob can always be found in that class of people. An excess of will is accompanied by unfairness and an unreasonable desire to run the universe for one's own particular benefit. A person of that kind cannot see that another may be wiser and better fitted for certain tasks than he is, no matter how patent his

limitations appear to others to be; for such an one has a notion that he was born to rule, or, at least, to keep other people straight, and he proceeds on that basis whenever and wherever he finds it feasible. Distinct as these three faculties are, it is impossible to separate them; and it requires all three of them to constitute a mind. Every trinity is of this sort. It is by nature a complex unit, and it cannot be anything else. A triad, on the contrary, never makes a true unit.

Triads are common in heathen cosmogonies. A god of the earth, a god of the air, and a god of the sky can be found in India as well as in Babylonia; and the modern Hindoo triad, Brahma-Visnu-Siva, does not stand alone by any means. This may account, in part, for the propensity to regard the Christian's God as a triad, rather than as a trinity. Men take the language of Theology with too much literalness. They see one God in the Father, another in the Son, and a third in the Holy Spirit. No such position, however, is necessary; for the limitations of language and of human experience must both be reckoned with, and the important thing is never the form of the words used but their content.

Shallow thinkers maintain that James and Paul are at odds in their teachings concerning works. They appear to be, but that is all. Paul has in mind the tithing of mint and anise and cummin, while James is thinking of the daily life and conduct of a believer. Paul says that the just shall live by faith, not by the minute observance of an external ceremonial law, which is a matter of form and not an inward experience. James asserts that a man who has faith must of necessity show it in his daily conduct. With that contention, Paul is evidently in hearty agreement. So far as the form of the words employed is concerned, a contradiction may seem to be involved; but the moment their content is considered any such implication is necessarily excluded from the premises. Paul's works are those of the Jewish law. The works referred to by James are Christian deeds of kindness and good will. There is therefore neither contradiction nor comparison in the two positions.

On this basis, "Father," "Son," and

"Holy Spirit" must be considered in regard to the content of each expression as a technical term. They cannot, accordingly, be dealt with as words that are to be taken in a literal materialistic sense. They are the simplest and best means that we have for conveying the thought that lies behind them; but their form should not be allowed to overshadow the fact that the thing meant is not necessarily what would be meant in ordinary daily conversation. Technical terms are always peculiar in their use. They must be of necessity. These are no exception, even if their domain is that of religion, and the importance of this fact cannot be overestimated. The thing itself should be kept in mind, and its meaning will become clearer as the argument progresses. Certain other matters, however, may be helpful in this connection if they are considered first.

To return to man himself: every human being, taken as a whole, constitutes a trinity, since no man has ever lived who did not possess a body, a soul, and a spirit. Each of these three things must be accepted as a true entity of some sort. To omit any one of them is to produce something less than a man. All three are found in a man; and it is impossible to create a man, as we understand that word, without involving each and every one of the three. What each one is, does not necessarily matter in this connection, since the fact itself is generally recognized; and yet it may be well to turn aside for a moment to consider briefly the character of each, in the effort to get a better idea of the complex nature of man.

The world in which we live is an enormous mass of inert inorganic material. This material constitutes the so-called Mineral Kingdom. On the surface of the earth, however, organized matter appears in the flora and fauna of the different regions as we know them. These are grouped respectively as the Vegetable Kingdom and the Animal Kingdom. The chasm between the inorganic mineral kingdom and the organic vegetable kingdom is bridged by a mysterious force which we call life. This force takes the inert matter of the earth's crust and forms it into a cellular structure, which, in turn, produces the thing commonly called a plant. In the broad sense of

the word, vegetables of every sort and kind have a "body" made up of this general cellular tissue. All living creatures also possess a body, which, in like manner, consists of a peculiar cellular structure more highly organized, for the most part, and more complex than that found in the vegetable kingdom. Man himself therefore has a body so constituted, and he has it in common with the plants and the animals. It is the direct result of the action of life, first on the mineral substances of the earth's surface and then on the organic matter consumed by the creatures of the animal kingdom. Up to this point, the situation is fairly simple and clear.

The chasm between the vegetable kingdom and the animal one is not so easy to determine. The two seem to merge in the lower forms of life. As soon, however, as a sharp distinction can be made, the higher forms having been reached, it becomes plain that animals possess the power of motion and have a capacity for sense-perception. They can experience such things as cold and heat, wetness and dryness, hunger and thirst, joy and pain; and the question at once arises: What new force has been added to life to make this result a possibility? So far as his body is concerned, man is an animal; and he accordingly shares this faculty of sense-perception with the animals. What part of him is responsible for the fact?

But there is another chasm to be bridged. It lies between man and the animals properly so-called. Man thinks. He reasons. He distinguishes right from wrong. He looks at things and ponders them before making up his mind. And he apprehends and worships God. No mere animal can accomplish such results. An animal is a creature of impulse. He obeys the strongest motive that chances to impel him. He does not even know that it is a motive. He feels, and then he acts. Experience is his guide, and pleasure and pain constitute the bulk of that experience. Men will do things in spite of pain, simply because they are right. Animals have no such power. They follow and obey their limitations. What, then, can this third force be called which is a part of man but not a part of



any animal? What does man possess which no animal can have?

It is evident that no animal can have what we call a spiritual nature. The thing is unthinkable. The spirit, therefore, appears to be the element which enables man to overtop the animals, as he does, and God breathed it into him at the beginning. He is accordingly, in a real sense, "a living creature." He possesses a spirit, and no mere animal can do that. Spirit is a new force above and beyond the animals. What does that signify?

The logical conclusion, from which there seems to be no way of escape, compels us to turn to the soul as the intermediate force, by means of which man perceives and experiences the various phenomena surrounding him in this world. But he shares that force with the animals! Can an animal, therefore, have a soul? The very idea is likely to be received with incredulity or even horror. "Soul" and "spirit," however, have never been differentiated with sufficient care to prevent them from being constantly confused with each other, and "soul" is freely employed where the word spirit would probably cover the ground more accurately. Indeed, "animal soul" is actually used in some connections, as if there could be two kinds of souls,—animal and spiritual.

Men seldom think clearly in this domain, and much confusion accordingly prevails. They say "soul" and never stop to think what they mean. In the New Testament, we find both "soul" and "life" used, in the same connection, to render the word *psyche*. If a man is determined to save his life, he will lose it. And then, what is it going to profit him, if he gains the whole world and loses his own soul (life, R. V.)? In this teaching of Jesus (Matt. xvi. 25 f.), a single Greek word has been rendered in two ways, and it is evident that a single idea is intended to be expressed. The same part of man is referred to, in each instance, and it is that part which enables him to enjoy the things of this world. Nothing else will fit the passage, and experience proves that Christ told the truth.

Those who live for the pleasures of this present existence—are bound to have them,

in short—soon tire of them, and this class furnishes most of the suicides in civilized countries. Those, on the other hand, who sacrifice their pleasures for a life of righteousness soon discover that they have not lost life's zest but enhanced it. Things have changed. Their pleasures are no longer selfish. Life is simpler and more natural. And it is more satisfactory. In other words, they have saved it. And the selfish pleasure-seekers have lost theirs in the very effort to save it!

"Soul," then, may be said to cover the capacity to feel and to perceive. Sense-perception is accordingly its proper function, and the animals have it to a greater or less degree. It varies with them according to their position in the scale of being, and it may therefore be extremely feeble; but it is there, in some measure, nevertheless; and it bridges, more or less distinctly, the chasm between the animal and the vegetable kingdoms, somewhat as life bridges that between vegetable growth and mere mineral accretion or crystallization. Finally, spirit furnishes the force which places man at the top of the series. This, at least, with our limited knowledge and experience, is what the facts seem to indicate; but all such matters are beyond human powers of comprehension in some of their phases.

Man, then, is hopelessly complex. But the story is only partly told, even now; for his peculiarities of personality must still be considered, and these involve yet further complexities. Personality, as we know it, includes the whole of a man's make-up; and yet it varies in the same individual. Every man is said to be this or that according to the viewpoint of the one who speaks of him. The matter goes even deeper than that, however, and it goes deeper than has thus far been intimated. It may therefore be best to take up the remaining phases of the subject by themselves, in the next section.

---

"If any philosopher can persuade himself that the true and well-ordered *genera* of nature are the result of mechanical force, whatever name he may give them, he moves in a world altogether different from my own."—Prof. Max Muller.

# The Crime of the Higher Criticism

REV. J. W. MENDENHALL, LL.D.

Editor, *Methodist Review*, November, 1890.

## Concluding Paper.

### 1. *It underrates the biblical literature.*

If the books of the Old Testament were manufactured in the haphazard, miscellaneous, compilatory way, as the theorists assert, we can have little respect for those who had anything to do with their making. If Moses prepared the Pentateuch in any such way as they say it was prepared, he was the poorest of bookmakers, and incompetent to write even his own private memoranda. If, however, later men compiled, wrote, or produced the Pentateuch, as we have it, themselves scholars, scribes, wise men, the case against them is even worse than that against Moses. If the other books, such as "Joshua," "Judges," "First and Second Samuel," "Chronicles," "Ezra," "Isaiah," "Jeremiah," "Ezekiel," and "Daniel," were produced according to the methods suggested by the critics, we can no longer have any regard for such literature or the authors of it. Intelligent men never prepare books in that way. Bancroft never writes history as they say Moses wrote it, if he wrote it; Tennyson never writes poetry as they say David wrote the Psalms, if he wrote them; Hawthorne never wrote fiction as they say Daniel wrote his book, if he wrote it. Nor can a single instance of the biblical process of book-making, as the critics define it, be found in profane literature. Livy, Plato, Horace, Demosthenes, Aristotle, did not write in any such style or after any such process of book-making as is charged against the writers of the Old Testament. We repeat with emphasis, that if the Old Testament was produced in the *miscellaneous, illogical, unhistorical, illiterate and absolutely absurd way* as declared by the critics, it is an anomaly in literature, and unworthy of the common respect of scholars. Nevertheless, the critics affirm that their design is to magnify the Bible and give it an honorable place in literature! This is not only strange, it is ludicrous and ridiculous beyond all expression. A book prepared ac-

cording to the alleged process of the critics could have no claim on the intelligent attention of the scholar or the inquirer. It would lack in order, common sense, psychological force, and the evidences of human culture, and rejection of it would be universal. Nor can the Bible be elevated in human estimation as a literary book by the theory that it was prepared in a way that would disgrace all other literature and humiliate its writers or authors.

2. *The "higher criticism" deprives the Old Testament of its chief doctrine.* According to the teaching of the Christian Church the Old Testament contains a revelation of God as the world's creator and the Father of all mankind. He is represented as the one God, besides whom there is none other; as supreme over the universe; as holy, just, omnipresent, omniscient, and immutable; as jealous of his name and authority, and so opposed to all polytheism and idolatry. Monotheism is the core of the old revelation. From Genesis to Malachi we trace the existence of one God, exhibiting himself in various relations to the race in order to win their devotion and wean them from the religions of the world. Who would read anything but the most absolute monotheism into the Old Testament, or extract from it anything not in harmony with the doctrine? The critics, however, affirm that the God of the Old Testament was a national God, just as Zeus was the god of the Greeks and Amon the god of the Egyptians. Jehovah was the God of the Hebrews, limited but powerful, and no more the supreme God of the universe or of nations than Zeus or Amon.

Hence, a conflict is now on hand between conservatives and rationalists as to the monotheism of the Old Testament. Was it national or universal? Was Jehovah the God of the Jews only, or the God of the Gentiles also? It is admitted that the monotheism of the Old Testament under-



goes a development from the patriarchal period to the times of Amos and the last school of the canonical Jews; but it is not a development from a national to a universal monotheism. It is a development of manifested attributes, epiphanies, and teachings that more clearly demonstrate the unity, supremacy, and universal authority of one God; it is a development not from local to universal rule, but from dim recognition of the sole Deity to transparent affirmations of his infinite character and all-comprehending government of the worlds and races that inhabit them. The question, "Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" signified in the Abrahamic times a monotheistic conception as broad as anything we find in the later times of David, or Isaiah, or Paul. It needed amplification, however, and under the Mosaic dispensation the great thought of one God paralyzed idolatry in Israel and lifted the nation far above their polytheistic neighbors.

The expansion of the monotheistic conception in its incipient to its unquestioned and completely developed form in Judaism is an interesting study, and furnishes proof of the method of the Old Testament revelations. Nearly every great truth which it announces has in its pages a gradual development from dimness to transparency, from uncertainty even to assurance, but never such a development as involves a change of character, or quality, or significance, of the doctrine. If the monotheism of the Old Testament was purely national and local, its very character was changed when it became absolute and universal; but this was impossible. It is as impossible to develop a national into an absolute monotheism as it is to develop a national god into the Supreme Being. It is possible to change from darkness of conception to clearness of apprehension, and from error of statement to certainty of declaration; but it is not possible to put the doctrine of monotheism through such an evolutionary process as, beginning with a local god, will end with the mighty, everlasting, universal Father. The Old Testament has not committed the folly of attempting to induct into the mind of the world the idea of the rulership, sovereignty, and universal fatherhood of God

by any such self-stultifying process as is made necessary if it commence with a national, and close with a universal deity. But the critic must advocate this kind of evolution, or expel from the Old Testament the doctrine of absolute monotheism altogether. If he assume the latter, of what value is the Old Testament as a revelation of God? In such a case it only reveals a local deity who is no more to the Gentiles than Zeus or Amon. We pressed some of the German critics on this point, and insisted that the Old Testament interpreted in this way loses its character as a revelation, the very thing needed in early times. We urged that David's Psalms abound in the most absolute monotheism, but Professor Baudissin replied that he accepted only one psalm (xviii<sup>th</sup>) as having a Davidic origin, and those that extolled Jehovah in his universal relations he referred to a very late period in Israel's history, when the idea at last took shape that the God of the Hebrews was possibly the Father of mankind. We also urged that the prophets represented Jehovah as above all gods and ruler of all men, but it was replied that, with the exception of Jeremiah and Amos, all such allusions were compatible with the narrow local interpretations, and that these two prophets had no broad conception of the divine sovereignty, but generalized a special fact without knowing its significance. We cannot now defend the Old Testament in its monotheistic teachings, but we call the attention of orthodox scholars to the eliminating work of the critics, and in this particular to its effect on fundamental doctrine.

3. *The "higher criticism" invalidates its own results by its deficient methods of investigation.* We have heretofore shown that the desultory methods employed in the examination of the biblical books would, if applied to any other literature, tear it into fragments. We may now cite the recent work of the critics on the *Odyssey*, in which, according to their method, they show it to be the product of four or five authors, and in its present form a compilation. Homer is ruled out of authorship. We can apply this method to Carlyle's *History of the French Revolution*, and prove he never wrote it; or to Plato's



works, and show their compilatory character, placing himself out of all relation to them. No one really knows who combined Aristotle's works into their present shape, and starting from this point it were easy to show that he is not the author of his *Logic*, *Ethics*, or *Metaphysic*. Livy also is a good author upon whom the critics might practice, for he would soon retreat under their blows. In studying their methods we are not so much alarmed for the Old Testament as we are interested in the fate of literature generally. The Old Testament can stand it, but literature cannot afford the risk of such criticism. If it destroy the one, it will surely destroy the other. Hence a reaction is bound to come, and the literary world will eschew the critics as readily as Nebuchednezzar condemned those who reported a false charge against Daniel.

Descending to particulars, we observe that the exegetico-grammatical method adopted by the critics is unadapted to the solution of the problems upon which they are working. Admitting that it is indispensable in the study of Hebrew literature, it cannot be employed on all the questions, facts, and doctrines, involved in that literature; that is to say, like any other method it has its limitations, and is of force only in the sphere to which it belongs. Questions of philology; interpretations of law, truth, and the spirit of the biblical system; indications of style, or special literary character of the books properly come within the province of the exegete and philological student, when, however, he ventures into the realm of biblical history, or the sphere of biblical authorship, with nothing more to aid him than a few Hebrew or Arabic roots, or the uncertain canons of exegesis, he trespasses upon the rights of other investigators, and must fail in reaching the best results. This is the mistake that the radical critics have made from the beginning, and they continue to make it. They expect to decide historical problems by the grammatical method, but the method is as inapplicable to the problem as the historical method is indeterminate in the sphere of astronomy. In their judgment a Coptic word, a Babylonian character, an Arabic phrase, and the Hebrew alphabet are the

talismanic influences that will open all doors and throw light upon the darkest recesses of the hidden truth. Historical problems, however, refuse a settlement on the exclusive philological basis. Pithom, according to Naville one of the Egyptian cities of Israel, is not wholly a philological question. Dr. Brugsch, the great explorer of Egypt, commenced his task as an infidel, with no interest whatever in the biblical record, but the archaeological evidence of the truth of the Old Testament in its references to Egypt was so conclusive that he yielded his prejudices, and today is a strong defender of the accuracy and integrity of the Old Testament records. Archaeology, not philology nor the exegetical methods, wrought this wonderful change in his faith. Egypt, Babylon, Ninevah and Syria, with Asia Minor and the isles of the Mediterranean, are in process of exploration, by which it is believed the Pentateuchal history, and the subsequent relations of Israel with Oriental nations will be fully validated. Such eminent scholars as Schrader, Brugsch, Naville, Delitzsch and Sayce have in their hands these Old Testament problems, and are doing more for their solution than such workers as Dillmann, Socin, Kuenen and Wellhausen, who are pettifogging with Arabic and Hebrew, or forcing a fallacious exegesis upon the inspired word. We can hope for a thorough vindication of the Old Testament only when archaeology has reclaimed the unread annals of empires and unlocked the passageways to the treasure-houses of the buried nations of the past. In addition to the archaeological method of investigation the critical scholar is also employing the purely historical method on purely historical problems, giving ground for belief that at last scholarship is adjusting itself to the several methods of inquiry necessary to an understanding of the biblical books. We cannot yet affirm, however, that the radical critics are alive to the importance of all these methods; they are yet too narrow in purpose, too anticipatory of conclusions, and too obstinately vigorous in maintaining theories to desire any other instruments of investigation than those they have hitherto employed. Yet the day is near at hand when philology, exegesis, archaeology, and



the true historical spirit will unite in corroboration of the Old Testament as an historical revelation of God.

4. The "higher criticism" is rather a theoretic than historical inquiry; it is a literary experiment in the domain of inspired literature rather than a defensive solution of the biblical problem. The critic is known as a theorist, his result is spoken of as a theory. Science reports facts, history events, theology doctrines, but higher criticism theories. It is useless to go to Wellhausen, Dillmann, or Pfleiderer for facts, they turn the inquirer away with mammoth verbal theories. Perhaps the most prominent critic in Europe is Professor Wellhausen, of Marburg, who following Reuss, Graf and others, has popularized the theory of the late origin of the Pentateuchal books, and is credited with effecting a revolution in the biblical realm. For the hour the theory is in the ascendant. Its fascination for the radicals is the destruction of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, and the postponement of its present literary form to the seventh century before Christ. In a very cordial interview with this leader of criticism, and in reply to a specific question, we were apprised that the strongest argument, in his estimation, for the theory is what he calls in his "Prolegomena," the *centralization of cultus*, or worship at Jerusalem. The Book of Deuteronomy, he alleges, makes manifest the existence of several places of worship in Palestine, while Leviticus and other books intimate but one center of worship—namely, the Holy City. From this the professor infers that Deuteronomy was written before Leviticus, because it refers to a religious condition that existed prior to the centralization as recorded in the other books of the Pentateuch. Having in this way established the priority of Deuteronomy, he employs a less transparent method for fixing the date of the much-discussed book, and concludes that it took shape in the time of Josiah upon the discovery of the Book of the Law. The other books of the Pentateuch were, therefore, later in appearance. We felt it to be a duty to inform the professor that if his theory rested on no higher pedestal than that of "centralization" it could be overthrown, ped-

estal and all; when he smilingly replied that in that event he would abandon it. This is an instance illustrative of the theoretic aspect of criticism; of the insufficiency of the results of criticism whereby many are misled in their faith; and of the folly of those schemes for the reconstruction of the Bible that rest upon no more certain basis than the wild notions of an extravagant critic.

Considered in its wholeness—its spirit, method, claims, and theoretic purposes—it is not too much to say that rationalistic criticism, such as prevails in Germany, and which has contaminated the religious thought of other countries, is little less than a crime against the truth of God. With all their discriminating abilities the German critics do not separate probabilities or conjectures from absolute results, but announce the one with the same assurance that they unfold the other. A theory has all the recognition of a truth, and until overthrown it dominates where truth should reign. Equally oblivious are these critics to all distinctions between *results and conclusions*. We are more than willing to accept verified results in the department of philology, archaeology, and history, but we are unwilling to accept the inferences the critics draw from such results. The trouble is not with results; we are waiting for them; we anxiously desire them; but the controversy is with the ill-reasoned conclusions of the critics—conclusions that are not justified by anything they have discovered or even suspected. Canon Farrar is obliged to say that the conclusions of the critics respecting the "Priestly Codex" cannot be ranked as yet among the accepted data of biblical criticism; and yet the conclusion is trumpeted abroad as if it were a truth. The theory of the late origin of the Book of Daniel cannot be accepted in the realm of criticism, in fact, it has been completely overthrown by an Oxford scholar, yet the critics are shouting for 165 B.C. The Wellhausen theory of the late origin of the Pentateuch cannot be accepted as resting upon any adequate basis, yet it is proclaimed as an epoch-making theory in biblical literature.

Results, not conclusions, are in order. It is a crime, with the former incomplete



and undetermined, to declare the latter. It is a crime to foist probabilities into the air when under analysis they turn out to be the unsupported inventions of theorists. It is a crime to dignify a conjecture with all the proportions, strength and character of a real fact, and to substitute one for the other. It is a crime to turn the Bible into a sporting-ground for theorists, who, unrestrained by conscience or the Christian faith, and neglectful even of intellectual order and honesty, assail the great

writers of the Old Testament with invective and *hauteur*, assign its books to periods and authors that neither history nor logic will support, eliminate the supernatural element with the fervor of infidelity, but in the guise of a professed faith, and trifle with the stupendous and priceless truths of a revelation whose chief value is derived from the very elements so ruthlessly expunged. *Such is the crime of the higher criticism.*"

It is distressing that church property is so frequently diverted from the uses for which it was originally designed. An instance is that of the City Temple in London, a church that was made strong and famous by the ministry of the great evangelical preacher, Dr. Joseph Parker. Its pulpit is now occupied by the Rev. Reginald Campbell, a combined agnostic, pantheist and religious anarchist. A similar case is that of Union Theological Seminary, New York. Another is likely to be that of Vanderbilt University. Still others are found in the great universities and many Congregational churches in New England. Such alienation of institutions from the purposes for which they were designed has constrained persons of wealth to hesitate to endow Christian institutions. They ask what guarantee can be given that these will retain their original character and continue to serve their original purpose. Courts are prone to rule in favor of the most popular and powerful litigants and no legal bond is too strong to be severed by them under given conditions. This is not true of all courts but of many, as the records show. The exceptions are many, indeed, and it is gratifying to quote this from the decision of a certain Judge Caton in rendering a decision in a case before him. He said: "Church property is rarely paid for by those alone who there worship, and those who contribute to its purchase or erection are presumed to do so with reference to a particular form of worship, or to promote the promulgation or teachings of particular doctrines or tenets of religion, which in their estimation, tend most to the salvation of souls; and to pervert the property to another purpose is an injustice of the same character as the ap-

plication of other trust property to purposes other than those designed by the donor. Hence it is that those who adhere to the original tenets and doctrines, for the promulgation of which a church has been erected, are the sole beneficiaries designed by the donors, and those who depart from and abandon these tenets and doctrines cease to be beneficiaries, and forfeit all claim to the title and use of such property."—*Presbyterian of the South.*

We can walk with the Holy Spirit by taking our Bibles, and, even if we have only two or three minutes a day, meditating upon the Holy Scriptures. Reading the Bible in that way, reading little every day, is like burning coal, because by burning coal we liberate the fire and life of long ago. Coal is the old vegetation pressed down in the earth and when it is brought out and lighted we are bringing out the heat and light of long ago for this generation. This is exactly what we do when we meditate upon the Bible; we liberate the inspiration of years ago.—*The Bishop of London.*

A Hindu was brought to forsake idolatry through a leaf of the Bible that came into his possession, upon which was the fifty-first Psalm, the prayer of David for cleansing. This was his gospel for twenty years. Then he met a missionary who gave him a Testament, when he exclaimed, "Twenty years I have walked by star light now I see the sun."

Will you join the Library Club to get or give \$1 or more to place THE CHAMPION in 1,000 Libraries or Reading Rooms? Write now!

## The Basis of Constructive Unity

REV. FRED. V. CHRIST.

Destructive criticism, Destructive dogma, Destructive usurpation of religious authority, Destructive denial of criticism, Destructive denial of dogma, Destructive denial of all authority—these are all heresies, either of the one who hangs on too hard or falls off too quick. They either hang till they die, or fall off and are killed. But they are always destructive. If this reign of Abaddon is to cease it must begin by decapitation. For properly speaking no construction ever takes place from the top—downward. Dilapidation and destruction—loosening of fabric, separation of adhesion—begin at top usually—sometimes at bottom. But *Construction* begins at the bottom. Satan fell from heaven; he did not rise from earth. If there is to be a construction and reconstruction of religious life and thought there are some fundamentals which a practical program cannot ignore—nor it appears, do without. The first of them is:

1. Religion is for all. It must be stated as a belief and a confession in terms which may be understood by all. So that a man, though a fool, may not err therein.

Part of the awful Kenosis of Christ must always be thought of as being—his becoming, as it were, on speaking terms with humanity. All the wisdom and knowledge of God, contracted and humanized to a possible impartibility, not to the great and learned, but to the weakest and most unlearned. This is the problem which God solved in Christ for the salvation of men. The simple but matchless stories and logia of the Master stand as evidence that He emptied himself of the pride of knowledge. Marvelous condition in which God's simplicity comes to meet and enlighten man's ignorance and diversity. But it is so because it is necessary. And if necessary and true, then it is best as being from and by the One who knows best. And both in matter and method will forever form the best medium of the contact which gives life and light.

Surely then we are not called upon to improve on this simplicity and truth as a means of imparting saving faith and knowl-

edge. What God-Christ has not done nor commanded to be done—and what his exemplary and practical wisdom shows cannot be done—is not to be attempted rashly. And this leads to the second fundamental consideration in this connection, which shows and confirms in an almost universal way the correspondence of the remarkable insight of Jesus and the practical wisdom of the people who would be taught.

2. Nine-tenths of the people know nothing at all of theological differences. Or, if any do know them, they do not care for them.

This statement needs no proof for any one who will make an experiment. Simply ask the rank and file of Christians what are the distinctive doctrines of their respective churches. This is a question affecting their knowledge. And if your experience be mine, the ignorance which you find of the dogmas upon which you expend so much energy and rabid discussion will frighten you into an amazing reflection on your life's work and its issue.

But if by chance (very remote) the rank-and-file-Christian does know the distinctive doctrines of his own church, then put the question again, but in reference to the belief of denominations outside of his own. If by chance (remote indeed) he knows what others believe and teach, he still answers only according to knowledge. Then put the question touching his charity. Ask him if he believes that all of the men of other denominations are rascals and going to hell. His answer to this question will show you that even if he does know, he does not really care. That his knowledge of religion, along with his choice of denomination, is of teaching and temperament—but that in its center of love he is with all other denominations. Two corollaries arise out of this condition of the average heart and mind:

1. There is already a constructive unity in the hearts of the rank-and-file Christians.

2. The dividing differences arise therefore in the minds of the false teachers and



preachers of higher criticism. *And principally as a result of intellectual pride.*

Canon Tait, in his preface to his book, *The Charter of Christianity*, says:

"In venturing to expound the teaching of our divine Lord, it must be felt that one undertakes a task of no ordinary magnitude. The loftiest exercise of which the human mind is capable is the study of sacred truth; but when the object of that study is to analyze the exact words of Christ himself it may well be said, 'Who is sufficient for these things?'"

Exactly. Then why do it? The book quoted from is an excellent book to read and study. It is, of course, a very mild instance of the spirit to which we refer—the author does not wish to change authorship into authority. But the author who becomes a leader does take his views to be authoritative. He gradually (by ballooning his ego) comes to put his interpretation by the side of or above the original, and in proportion to his greatness detracts so much from the original and diverts so much from the Christ. In a higher critical seminary no one reads the Bible for personal edification. He only uses it to prove, by texts, what the smartest man in his denomination has said about it. The young preacher who lost his sermon manuscript and announced he would do the *next best thing—read the Bible*—is a symbol of our age, in which the pride of men has overtopped the humility of God, and having overtopped it, ultimately toppled it over. Christ is with his Word a fountain. Who would want to quench his thirst with water many times re-drunk? Yet that is what the intellectual pride of our false teachers and preachers have compelled us to do spiritually. *Understand, the fault is not in thinking and writing and teaching—but in the shifting of the seat of authority from the Bible and Christ to the smartest student of it.* This leads us to the very tip of the tail of this theoretical theological absurdity. Here it is:

3. The differences of opinion which divide Christendom into so many parts are either vital or not vital. If really vital, then nobody but these false preachers and teachers who understand the intricate subtleties of the theological science of differences will be or can be saved. Who be-

lieves that? Absolutely no one at all. The probabilities are far greater that the HEAD which has learned all of these devious ways has permitted the Heart of his religion to die. The differences of opinion, then, really affecting the life of the great majority of Christians are not absolutely vital nor to be in any way compared with the Original Source, in authority. So the vast number of books on Critical Theology and kindred subjects may be (in fact in Protestantism must be) entirely ignored as respects authority. Higher and lower and intermediate good and bad criticism can all be cast aside as in any way affecting the Bible as the only infallible rule of faith and practice. This is true of it regardless of views on inspiration, history, myth, authorship. It simply, after the manner of most Christians, asks Christ and his Bible—How are we to live the Christian life? Who cares what the higher or lower critic says? No one. What man wishes is to be saved, and the Saviour and his word are the only means of grace in the world for the man in the world. Not by interpretation of learning but by appropriation of the Word are we to be saved or to preach salvation. A constructive program then must begin on the first, last, middle truth of the Protestant reformation. It will be a Lutheran Christian Renaissance of the principle—"The Bible as Christ's Word the only infallible rule of faith and practice."

The Lutheran Church will stand ready to throw away every doctrine and be part of a great conference of selected men of all denominations to make an attempt to realize for all men the difference between the essentials and non-essentials of salvation. This is a step towards constructive unity—a unity which will stand on the ground of essentials and permit in love the erection of temperamental details for individual denominations. It seems to me the only first step which may be taken.

William Adams Brown, in his book, *The essence of Christianity*, says in conclusion:

"What the theology of the future will be like in its details it is too soon to predict. But of one thing we may be sure. It will be a theology for the people. It will have its roots deep in life and will utter its mes-

sage in language so simple and direct that the layman as well as the theologian can understand it. It will address itself to permanent human interests and present Christ as the Lord and the Light of all life. . . . To such a theology, when it comes, there is a great work in store. To the Church it will re-interpret its faith, and give it a fresh consciousness of the Gospel which is its mission to preach. For the world it will clear away the misunderstandings and confusion which has often obscured the Christian message, and will concentrate attention upon the simple yet momentous decision upon which all turns at last. For the real question between Christianity and its opponents, it cannot be too often insisted is not primarily theoretical but practical."

These are the conclusive words of an expert modern thinker in a seminary where modern criticism is taught. Many things we cannot agree with. But there is recognized throughout the book and in this quotation the fundamental needs spoken of in this article. That is where construction must begin—for only out of such a fundamental constructive life can a real super-construction of lasting qualities be built.

One statement and two suggestions conclude this article. The statement is this: In all that is said above concerning a practical basis for constructive unity there is nothing to which a Roman Catholic can give assent. His Church is consistent. She allows no private opinion—no open Bible, no personal testimony to salvation except by her interpretation, no authority but the pope. Cardinal Gibbons states the only possible "constructive unity" there can be of Protestantism and Roman Catholicism—is that from or by absorption. He says: "The first essential requirement is the recognition of the sovereign pontiff as the successor of St. Peter, the divinely appointed head of Christendom."

Protestantism and Roman Catholicism are incapable of constructive unity. On the other hand, the different branches of Protestantism are capable of a constructive life and theology, and as evidence of it here are the two suggestions:

1. Start with the Protestant foundation: the Bible as the only infallible rule of faith and practice. Make every other book in the

world of less authority than the Bible. And so every man of less authority than Jesus Christ in religion. As a simple definition of a Christian something like this: Christianity is the worship and the service of Jesus Christ, as Saviour, Teacher, Example, as given to us in the four gospels.

2. But as a *provisional basis* of a constructive unity, let us add Luther's smaller catechism. Phillip Schaff says somewhere, "If the churches ever unite on a common symbol it will be the Augsburg Confession." Let us not go so far. But let us take this little masterpiece of concentration as a beginning which is simple enough for all, been used by all, copied by all—which can be gainsaid by none and which is really as ecumenical as the Apostles' Creed. It is the charter of Protestantism, the Magna Charta of the layman's theology—the *next stone after* the Bible cornerstone in the edifice which is to rise as a result of a constructive unity of endeavor for unity of life and liberty.

This article has not the pretence of great scholarship, but it has the pretence of the logic of life and events. It is the argument of the unheard-of millions who have sent me to herald the pain of their hurt spiritual lives and to tell you that they are ready for this Renaissance of Protestant principles for the holding fast of the nation to them for themselves and for their children. The Lutheran Renaissance is upon us now. It is a cry for the Open Bible and Simple Christianity. It cries aloud in Wall Street for the old-time Bible religion. It cries in Washington and the capitols of the states for a new Bible conscience in public life. It stalks abroad in the ranks of the unemployed and bellows and rages for love and justice. It seethes and smoulders in the colleges, runs wild in the newspapers, rolls over the footlights in the drama, and swells up in mighty waves to moan and surge around the throne of God. How long, O Lord, how long?

---

Charles Dickens in a letter to his son says: "I send you a New Testament with the other books, because it is the best book the world has ever known and will know."



## Not Two Isaiahs

DR. JAMES STRONG.

*Methodist Review*, March, 1890.

1. *The external testimony is overwhelming against the hypothesis of a duplex authorship.* Not a whisper or suspicion of such a theory is to be found, so far as we can discover, in any ancient writer, many of whom were quite as well qualified and full as acute as any modern critic to suggest and decide upon such a question. The Jews of all ages, including our Lord himself and his apostles, cite abundantly from both parts of the book, often by express name, without the least discrimination, or showing the slightest symptom of misgiving as to the authorship of either. In like manner religious teachers and scholars of the highest grade in modern times quote and expound passages from both parts indifferently in this respect, intentionally ignoring the theory in question, although aware of it. The great mass of professed critics at the present day repudiate the hypothesis altogether, and the few that openly espouse and advocate it are almost, if not altogether, of the negative or destructive school, who are ready to pick nearly every other book of the Bible to pieces on the most frivolous pretext.

Moreover, no manuscript or version exists, or at least has yet been brought to light, which at all countenances such a dismemberment of Isaiah's book. It stands in every canon, ritual, and service volume an entire and complete unit, without bracketed diminution or apocryphal addition, or any other mark whatever of doubt as to the authenticity of either portion.

In fact, the originators and supporters of the opinion in question rest their whole cause upon internal evidence, not presuming to claim external testimony for it. They admit that it is merely an *hypothesis* and seek only to fortify it by magnifying the variations. They really have nothing new to offer beyond what has always been known, which can be satisfactorily explained on other principles. It requires some more palpable and positive proof to overthrow such a mass of unanimous con-

viction on a matter that has stood the scrutiny of ages.

2. *On the other hand, we contend that the two portions of Isaiah's prophecies are not only not discrepant, but actually harmonious, and that they mutually sustain each other.* For this purpose we will compare them more closely and exactly in the light of the foregoing analysis. The argument is a brief one, however, and we do not need to go into tedious details. A comparatively small number of clear coincidences will be decisive, in the acknowledged absence of direct contradictions or manifest incongruities.

In the first place, scarcely any new topics are introduced in the latter half of the book that were not at least hinted at or germinally contained in the former half. For example, the great lessons of legal and moral purity are plainly alluded to and earnestly enforced repeatedly in both halves; hypocrisy, luxury, and cruelty are emphatically denounced in both; and Jehovah's worship alone is pointedly and imperatively required. The Messianic nature of the Jewish economy and destiny is clearly unfolded in both, and it is in the former portion (vii. 14; ix. 6) that those striking passages concerning Immanuel, the God-man, occur. Even the calling of the Gentiles, that so-esteemed innovation of early Christianity, which is prominent in the latter part of the book, is more adumbrated in the former part also (ii. 2-4; xi. 10; xix. 18-25). The millenium is not foreshadowed in the latter half of the book only, but is decidedly intimated in the former half likewise (ii. 4; xi. 6-9, compared with lxxv. 25).

In the second place, to the objection that the great stumbling-block of Judaism—the doctrine of a suffering Messiah—which is stated so conspicuously and mostly in the *past tense*, as if an accomplished fact, in the central chapter of the second portion (liii.), is not distinctly intimated in the former portion; we reply that nevertheless

we find passages in the earlier part of the book which not very obscurely imply the cognate truth of the patient character of the Redeemer (xi. 4; xxxii. 2), and thus ally themselves to kindred ones on the latter part too (xlii. 2, 3; lxi. 1-3). In like manner is the famous prediction of Cyrus *by name* (xliv. 28; xlv. 1-4) as the future deliverer of the captive Jews, especially pointed to as marking a different epoch in the history of prophecy. Indeed, some go so far as to infer that it must have been written *after the event*, reasoning on the perverse principle of the improbability, or rather impossibility, of such a preannouncement. This is to take the old infidel position, assumed by Celsus and Porphyry against the genuineness of certain parts of Daniel, especially the eleventh chapter, which so minutely traces the course of the Ptolemaic dynasty. But why should it be thought impossible for God to inspire a prophet with a knowledge of Cyrus's *name* centuries before his birth any more than to inform him of the *events* themselves? The fact of the Jews' deliverance from the Babylonian exile is clearly foretold in the first half of Isaiah (xi. 11-16; xiv. 1-4; xxxv. 10), and the agency of the Medes and Persians is explicitly mentioned as effecting it (xiii. 17-19; xxi. 2, 9); and why might not the same prophet go on in the latter part of his book to give further details? It seems to us the most natural and consistent thing in the world for him to do so. In a similar way, after having given some particulars concerning the birth of the Messiah in his earlier prophecies, he might well be supposed to add others concerning the Messiah's death in his later prophecies. So also he might very rationally and appropriately supplement the account of the Messiah's advent, prefigured in the earlier portion of his book, by specific allusion to his forerunner—the Baptist—in the later portion (xl. 3). No one can deny the feasibility or credibility of such a course except on the *a priori* principle of denying real fore-knowledge by inspiration to the prophet. To such a miserable shift are unbelievers at last reduced.

In the third and last place we perceive no distinct peculiarity in the style or phrase-

ology of the writer in these two portions of the book, such as to negative his identity. Both are splendid in their execution, the first half certainly not the less so, in parts at least; for example, chap. xxi.-xxii. 14, which is unsurpassed, if equalled, by any passage of Scripture for boldness of conception, magnificence of imagery, vividness of portrayal, and terseness of diction. Nor is there anything remarkable in the variation of the plan and method adopted in the two parts of the book—one miscellaneous and the other consecutive. Such an arrangement might easily be paralleled in the works of many an author. Indeed, it would be the most simple and self-prompted proceeding imaginable for the prophet, in his declining years, to gather up in somewhat promiscuous manner, the *effata* of his previous career, uttered or written on various occasions and in disconnected records, and to supplement them by the mature ratiocinations of his later reflections and communings in an orderly and more complete form.

In short, we have in the work before us nothing more than a collective and revised edition, by the author himself, of his own effusions and fugitive pieces, with a copious appendix expanding, continuing, illustrating and completing his various themes. Even if there were something entirely new in this additional part, it would not be at all remarkable; for surely the same writer may be supposed to be competent to improve upon the productions of his earlier years. We conclude, therefore, from this legitimate process of sifting, collating, and deducing, that the book is, in all probability, the work of a single author individual, as it purports, and has almost universally been held, to be; and that we have no occasion for the hasty and gratuitous supposition of two independent writers consciously or unconsciously co-operating in producing it.

We may add that we do not deem this question of the identity of authorship an idle or unimportant one; for, although we are not sure who wrote certain others of the books of the Bible, and yet do not on that account discard them from the canon, the case is different with apocryphal addi-



tions, such as this in that case would prove to be; and in fact it is evidently for the very purpose of invalidating the authority of these latter chapters that the theory in question has been expounded. The skeptical spirit has taken offense at their explicit-

ness in predicting the very name of Cyrus and the passion of Christ; and seeks to destroy this clinching proof of inspiration and re-clinching proof of inspiration and religious doctrine.

## The Deutero-Isaiah

REV. A. H. TUTTLE, D.D.

The deutero-Isaiah is supposed to be a great prophet of the exile who has lost his name in that of the historic Isaiah who prophesied in the days of Uzziah and Hezekiah, B. C. 740-700. With the single exception of him who blotted out his name, he is the greatest prophet that the Revelation people ever produced. Nor is he inferior in any particular to that unsurpassed prophet who antedated him by perhaps two hundred and fifty years. He not only equalled, but reproduced in marvelous exactness every intellectual and spiritual detail of that earlier colossal personality. In the breadth of his spiritual thought, the uniqueness of his literary style, the lofty flight and rhythmical movement of his wings, the singular fulness and clearness of the gospel doctrines he unfolded, in his luminous vocabulary so unlike other Hebrew writers, and in that inimitable something we call genius, this second Isaiah is indistinguishable from the first. They are so perfectly alike that the editor of *THE CHAMPION*, who is not easily deceived, once mistook the two for twins. Though they were separated in birth by more than two centuries and lived and grew up in an environment widely diverse in geography, history, social conditions and religion, the contemporaries of the second actually mistook him for the first Isaiah; and perpetuated the sentiment among the Hebrew people which they have never questioned even to this day, that the two were actually one.

It is an instance of a most inexplicable ingratitude: for this deutero-Isaiah more than all the other heroes of the exile cheered the hearts of the captives, and held their faith firmly to the assurance of the covenant that God had made with Abraham, and strengthened their courage to ex-

(Vol. xviii.—II.)

pect and achieve their return to the land and kingdom of their fathers. But this most majestic figure of their day was never reported by those who knew and loved him best. They speak of many other great men of the exile, Ezekiel, Daniel, Haggai, Zachariah, Zerubbabel, Nehemiah and Ezra, but this the tallest of them all is never even alluded to. In the long lists of names we have of that interesting period Isaiah's does not appear. Never did ingratitude so flagrantly falsify history. He came to his own, and his own received him not. But the scholarship of our day has laid bare the wrong, and rescued this mightiest of them all from his shameful obscurity and given him his meed of praise.

A remarkable thing about this second Isaiah is that he who was born and did his work in Babylon evolved a literary style which has not the faintest tinge of Babylonian coloring. No other writer of the exile was able to do that. Ezekiel, Daniel, Ezra and the others paint their pictures of heavenly realities with brushes dipped in Babylonian oils and pigments. With them we walk amid palaces and monster images; we hear the tramp of soldiers and the rumble of chariot wheels; we see waving palms and long canals and wide stretches of level plains. The atmosphere is foreign. But Isaiah gathers all his colors from the hill country of Palestine which he had never seen. He images his thought with trees, flowers, animals, rocks, caves, and mountain torrents, none of which were known in Babylon. Furthermore, his terms and idioms of speech are Palestinian and in striking contrast with the synonyms of his companions in exile. It is a literary anachronism which some would explain by supposing that later scholars recast the original work. So these "redactors" manu-

factured flowers of wax and paper and artificially fastened them on the original plant. And they did it with such consummate art that the fraudulent bloom emits the spiritual fragrance of life. Critical scholarship may hesitate to admit the supernatural predictive element in prophecy; but who can question the supernal literary facts?

But accepting the second Isaiah whom recent scholarship has discovered, we find him gifted with a stupendous predictive vision. He foretells things far beyond the days of the return of the exiles. He sees not only the temple of Zerubbabel fully rebuilt but also that of Herod. He pictures not only the advent of Christ but the very character of the Christian Church which the Apostles themselves could not conceive until after the ascension of their Lord. He tells of a faith dissociated from national forms, a church spiritual without an altar or a ritual, an inner heart of goodness unshackled by ethical rules, a church including all nations of the earth. And this he does with no meagerness of details but minutely and exactly. He speaks of it not as a future event but as a present, or as already become a thing of the past. The descriptions are so like those of eye witnesses as to persuade many that they were spoken after the events had transpired, or when they were immediately impending. Hence the growth of the idea that there were not simply a second but many Isaiahs, every one of whom has shared the fate of the second and lost his identity in the first and undisputed first Isaiah. But if we hold only to a second prophet of this name we still retain the supernatural element of prophecy.

Finally, I have tried in all seriousness to place myself in the attitude of one who believes in the twofold authorship of the incomparable prophecy of Isaiah, and pick my way with him over the chaotic void which higher criticism has made of this sublime masterpiece of Hebrew literature. But I find that when I have begun to untwist the mighty cable into two strands, I am forced by the same logic to untwist both of these into others until at last I discover that I am trying to cross the chasm by leaping from one to another of many slender

threads. They all break under my tread. I grow dizzy, I reel; I throw up my hands in despair; I am lost.

15 New St., East Orange, N. J.



Dr. Tuttle, who wrote a very striking and most convincing article on "The Unity of Isaiah" in *THE CHAMPION*, November, 1913, was asked to write another on "Deutero-Isaiah." It appears above. We read it with amazement and caught our breath when he pictured the editor of *THE CHAMPION* mistaking the two Isaiahs for twins. We did not entirely feel easy until we found him leaping from one to another of the many slender threads which broke under his tread. We were rejoiced at his despair. This gem of literary work is a sermon which will be lifelong in its impressions with every candid and fair-minded reader. Many spoke of his former article and declare that it had settled their doubts forever. Very many will feel the same conviction of truth as they read this one—*write him*.—EDITOR.

Berlioz has a story of a young musical student who asked for a sonata in five sharps. "But, mademoiselle," suggested the clerk, "will not this in five sharps be too difficult?" "Pooh!" she replied, disdainfully. "That is all one to me. Whenever I find more than two sharps or flats I scratch them out with my penknife." Just so some critics treat the Bible. If they find things too hard for them or that go counter to their preconceived ideas or desires they scratch them out.—*Herald and Presbyterian*.

Prof. Goldwin Smith is not orthodox himself, but he insists on the necessity of a faith in both heaven and hell for the law and order of society. The beast in man has never been restrained except by a religion firmly believed. Faith that there is a God who will reward and punish.—*Ex.*

Will you join the Library Club to get or give \$1 or more to place *THE CHAMPION* in 1,000 Libraries or Reading Rooms? Write now!



## Our Lord's Two Sermons.

REV. J. S. AXTELL, D.D.\*

In a recent issue of *THE BIBLE CHAMPION* (August, 1914), a very just criticism was made by Judge Francis J. Lamb on Professor Bacon's theory and discussion in his book on "The Sermon on the Mount." Professor Bacon, following most critical expositors, tries to show that Matthew and Luke give different accounts of the same discourse. Judge Lamb shows very clearly that the time and place indicated in the two accounts are different; and hence that we have reports of two discourses, instead of different reports of the same discourse.

Writers who, like Professor Bacon, try to reconstruct the discourse according to their own ideas, do not agree in their conclusions. Some think that Matthew gives the best report. Others prefer Luke. Their conflicting theories and arguments are not satisfactory. We have no right to assume that the Gospel writers give incorrect reports. It is more rational and in every way more satisfactory to regard them as giving accounts of different discourses. Our Lord gave many other discourses. Many are mentioned that are not reported. Each writer gave an account of one that best suited his purpose in writing.

An examination of the two discourses show, not only that they differ in time and place, as Judge Lamb has proved, but also in purpose, plan and contents.

The purpose of the two discourses was different. This may be seen in the circumstance, plan and contents of the discourses. In the first (Matt. v. ff) "the disciples came to him, . . . and he taught them." This was early in his work. He had called a few disciples, and he addressed them as disciples. This was their induction into discipleship. This was his induction discourse. It gives the characteristics of an ideal disciple and gives the chief points of the ideal law of the kingdom of God. In the second (Luke vi. 20, ff), after spending all night in prayer, he chose his twelve apostles, and then coming down with them he "stood on a level place" and, lifting up his eyes on

his disciples, he said, "Blessed are ye poor," etc. This was a discourse to his disciples in preparation for work in the kingdom. It states the qualifications and characteristics of efficient workers. It was the first public recognition of the chosen apostles; it was their public induction and inauguration into office. It was their inauguration instruction, and as such it is the ideal instruction to all who would become workers in the kingdom of God.

The plan of the two discourses, in accordance with the purpose of each, is essentially different. The first states the beatitudes of beautiful character and of beautiful conduct and affirms that those who have these characteristics are the salt of the earth and the light of the world (Matt. v. 1-16). It then enlarges upon the law of the kingdom, requiring a loving spirit toward all men (v. 17-48), and teaching how to fulfil our higher duties to God (vi. 1-7; 12). It then urges a wise and practical conformity to these precepts. The second begins with the beatitudes of cross-bearing and pronounces a woe upon those who find their consolation in riches, indulgence, pleasures and popular applause (Luke vi. 20-26). It then states the qualifications for successful work (vi. 27-45). It ends, like the first, with an exhortation to build strictly upon the foundation principles here laid down (vi. 46-49).

The substance of the two discourses, as already indicated, is essentially different. They have, indeed, some expressions in common; but identity of substance is not proved by finding some words the same in both. The same words may be used to express different thoughts and a different purpose. In examining the two discourses before us it seems impossible that any one should think of them as different reports of the same discourse.

In the first the beatitudes point out the inner, spiritual qualities that are essential to discipleship. The "poor in spirit" are those who are conscious of need, receptive, eager to learn. "They that mourn" are those who are conscious of sin, sensitive,

\*Pastor of Lebanon Presbyterian Church, Homestead, Pa., Sept. 10, 1914.

tender-hearted, conscientious. "The meek" are the submissive, the orderly, the obedient. Meekness is not weakness, but is essential to effective organization. These are qualities of true disciples, who also "hunger and thirst after righteousness," are "merciful," "pure in heart," "peacemakers," and aggressive in life. These general terms describe the ideal disciple who is and will be as salt and as light in the life of the world.

In the second discourse the beatitudes describe conditions of service, rather than elements of character. The apostles in becoming disciples must, of course, have all the beatitudes of beautiful character; but in becoming workers in the kingdom they must in addition be willing to take up the cross of poverty, of hunger, and of sorrow; and, as good soldiers, find their strength, their glory and their blessing, not in the consolation of earthly comforts, but in the loss of all things for effective service and for Christ's sake.

In the first discourse the "law and the prophets" are recognized and the application of the ten commandments is greatly widened and deepened. The golden rule and divine perfection are made the standard of ideal discipleship. In the second discourse there is no mention of the law, but special attention is given to the qualifica-

tions of successful workers. First, they must be actuated by love. They must have sincere love even for those that appear as enemies, for otherwise they can do them no good. Secondly, they must be unselfish and be willing to "lend" and to "give" even to their enemies. Thirdly, they must have a clear view of the right and good, so as not to be "blind guides." Fourthly, they must be correct in character and not pretend to see a mote in another's eye, while a beam is in their own eye. And, fifthly, they must have a good life and a full heart; for a life, like a tree, is known by its fruits, and out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh.

Thus the two discourses differ in plan, contents and purpose. The first was clearly for all disciples to teach them what they ought to be and to give them the law of life in the kingdom of God. The second was more personal and went farther. It was given to the apostles and to all workers. It describes clearly the conditions and the qualifications of true and efficient workers. The two, therefore, are not the same and should not be confused. We miss the purpose of each when we regard them as one. The second is an addition to the first. We need both.

### THE BIBLE.

Daniel Webster said that if we will only abide by the principles taught in the Bible our country will go on prospering and to prosper; but if we and our posterity neglect its instructions and authority no man can tell how suddenly a catastrophe may overwhelm us and bury all our glory in profound obscurity. If this were more carefully observed by those who use the pulpit and try to use the Church for civic, sociological, and all kinds of secular matters, the happy outcome would be sooner seen and the likelihood of the catastrophe be made the more remote.—*The Herald and Presbyterian*.

"A Macedonian who came to a gospel meeting in Toronto was struck by hearing the words, 'Take the Bible, read it, and live according to its teachings.' In the course of time he left the city and

returned to his native village in Macedonia. One Sunday morning a missionary entered that village. He was very much astonished to see a man standing in the midst of a group of others and reading the New Testament to them. The missionary asked him how he had learned to read the Bible. Then the man told him that he had been to Canada and lived in the city of Toronto, and that some words which he had heard at a gospel meeting were continually ringing in his ears—"Take the Bible, read it, and live according to its teachings." He added, 'Before I left Toronto I bought a New Testament, and it opened my eyes. Now I am reading it aloud here, in the hope that somebody else may be healed.'"—*Missionary Voice*.

"Nobody ever outgrows Scripture; the book widens and deepens with our years."—*Spurgeon*.



## THE COUNCIL.

### THE BIBLE OF THE Y. M. I. A.

*"The Bible—Its Reliability and Authority,"*

As taught by the Secretary of the  
Y. M. C. A. (New York City).

#### I. *The Reliability.*

1. We must approach the subject without prejudice.

a. We must use the same tests that we would for any other book, because the Bible has been produced by the same methods as any other book, although we have seen the motive was different.

b. A great furor was raised in 1860 when Professor Jowett said, "Interpret the Scriptures like any other book."

c. The traditional belief of sixty years ago was that "the Bible is a miraculously inspired book, every word literally true, every event historical, without myth or legend,—infallible, the whole being the product of direct inspiration from God and therefore equally authoritative in all its parts." Some men still believe it, but they are few. Others claim verbal inspiration for the original manuscripts, but that does not help any.

No fair-minded man, who is familiar with the various readings of the oldest manuscripts, with the history of the various versions and translations, and with recent archaeological discoveries, will attempt to maintain before intelligent men the verbal inspiration of the Bible and its infallibility.

#### II. *Is the Bible Reliable?*

1. What do we mean by reliable?

a. Reliable as to statement of facts?  
b. Reliable as to motive of authors? c. Reliable as to fundamental teachings?

2. Reliability as to statement of fact.

a. Flatness of the earth. Calvin and Luther ridiculed Copernicus because he contradicted the book of Joshua. Calvin thought he proved Copernicus wrong by Psalm 93, "The world is also established, it cannot be moved."

b. Can we reconcile the atrocities and barbarities perpetrated in the name of God?

c. Can we reconcile the books of Kings with Chronicles? d. The history in Daniel is erroneous. e. The dates in Ezra cannot

be harmonized. f. There are contradictions in the Gospels.

3. Reliability as to motive of authors.

a. Their judgment was not infallible any more than ours are in determining our actions in the affairs of daily life. b. When one did a noble deed, they believed God told him to do it and they recorded the imaginary conversation. c. The deception practiced by the Patriarchs is recorded rather in the spirit of commendation than of condemnation.

4. Reliability as to fundamental teaching.

a. Give to stranger, or sell to foreigner (Deut. xiv. 21). b. Thou shalt be perfect with Jehovah thy God (Deut. xviii. 13). c. Lend not upon interest to thy brother, unto a foreigner thou mayest lend (Deut. xix. 20). d. Life for life; eye for eye; tooth for tooth (Ex. xxi. 23-25).

5. The Bible is reliable when viewed from the right position.

a. It gives a reliable account of Jewish ideas concerning the world, God, their own importance, and concerning morals and ethics, but as soon as we move outside of Jewish ideals, the Old Testament loses much of its reliability. This is true to a degree of the New Testament also.

#### III. *Its Authority.*

1. The authority of the Bible is a very different matter than its reliability.

2. Authority does not make anything true; it declares only.

3. The Romanist accepts the Bible as authoritative because the Church tells him so; the Protestant accepts it because he says God tells him so. Just how these recognize the voice of God is not always made clear.

4. There has scarcely ever been an evil that has not been defended by quotations from the Bible. The Bible is always a resort for certain of evil-doers. For centuries all that was necessary to settle a dispute was to quote from the Bible. Polygamy, slavery, murder of heretics, tyranny, war, cruelty, and witchcraft, have all been supported on the authority of the Bible.

Only a fool loses faith in the Bible when he is shown that he is wrong in supposing

that God sanctions what all men know to be evil. Many noble men and women have been led to despise the Bible and the Church because of what it was thought the Bible taught.

5. The mischief of the whole thing is the erroneous conception of the Bible. We have lost the sense of the justice of God and held fast to the traditions of men. The Bible is so much a product of the times in which it was written that it cannot be literally binding for later times.

#### 6. Standard of Authority.

a. No statement becomes authoritative because of its expounder. A thing is true, if true at all, before a statement has been made concerning it. The statement of Micah, Jesus, or Paul, does not make a thing true. The statement of Galileo, Copernicus, Kepler, and Newton, did not make things true. Harvey's statement that the blood circulates did not make it circulate. b. The statements of all teachers, prophets, and priests have become authoritative and have remained so just so long as they were supported by facts and no longer. c. The only ultimate standard of truth in science, morals, ethics, and religion, or in any other field is the alert mind of man furnished with a broad experience in that field.

#### IV. *The Authority of the Bible.*

1. Let us remind ourselves again that our religion is not founded on the Bible, but that the Bible is a complement and a supplement to our religious experience.

2. And again that in the Old Testament loyalty to God was loyalty to a system of commandments. To be holy, one must be ceremonially perfect. He does what he is told to do, because he is told and not because he sees any reason for doing it.

3. The attitude of Jesus toward the Old Testament.

a. Ye have heard it said—, but I say.

b. Jesus meant his followers to use the same liberty as He did.

4. How are we to know what is authority?

a. God is consistent. b. Jesus is consistent. c. Judgment is based upon righteousness and equity. d. Any teaching that represents God other than a Father of love

and righteousness cannot become authority for us. Such teaching must be regarded as a misrepresentation of experience, or a misunderstanding of facts. e. Any statement attributed to Jesus which is not in harmony with the ideal of His life and teaching cannot be accepted as His. f. All teaching and all ideals consistent with our highest conception of God and of Jesus in the twentieth century, from whatever source, from whatever time, are our standard of authority. The highest ideals making for moral, ethical and religious living are found in the teachings of Jesus. Hence, the Bible contains the standard of all that is highest, noblest and best for the moral, ethical and religious development of man.

---

#### THE DEVIL IN CAP AND GOWN.

Prof. Lucius Hopkins Miller, assistant professor of Biblical Instruction in Princeton University, recently published an article in *The Biblical World*, in which he declared that little or nothing was known of the birth of Christ; that the gospel records concerning Him are not historical or reliable; that his death was only the attestation of His love and service, and his post resurrection appearances are either spiritual seances or subjective psychological impressions on the minds of the disciples. Thus this professor of Biblical Instruction, in a university established by Christian men, on a Christian foundation, deliberately attempts to destroy the faith of the boys committed to his care.

At the time of the appearance of his article in *The Biblical World*, *The Presbyterian* exposed his position, and warned Christian people against this fearful and destructive influence, and the peril in which it placed their sons on the whole question of their Christian faith. This edition of *The Presbyterian* was promptly exhausted.

At the same time, we wrote to Professor Miller, disclaiming any personal feeling, but informing him that duty would require us to continue to expose his pernicious teachings. Our articles from time to time brought forth appreciative responses from Princeton alumni, parents of sons attending college, and others. Then there was



a lull, a watchful waiting, but now comes Rev. Dr. Ford C. Ottman, well-known throughout the country, who, under the striking title, "The Devil in Cap and Gown," reviews the article in *The Biblical World*, more thoroughly and more extensively than would be appropriate in a weekly journal. Dr. Ottman's pamphlet has brought forth comment from the press, and, in general, it is a condemnation of the deceptive policy which permits a man to pretend to teach the Bible, who at the same time destroys those teachings. We believe the Trustees of Princeton and Dr. Miller will receive the unqualified condemnation of thinking men of all views in this country. If this deception and trickery is continued, it must be to the injury of the institution, for this age will not stand for such double dealing in the instructors of their youth.—*The Presbyterian*.

#### "NOT EFFECTIVE MEANS TO THE END IN VIEW."

Under this caption *The Continent* discusses Dr. Ford C. Ottman's criticism of Professor Lucius H. Miller.

Professor Miller, who is assistant Biblical instructor in Princeton University, had an article, some months ago, in *The Biblical World*, in which he declared that little or nothing is known of the birth of Christ; that the gospel records concerning Him are not historical or reliable; that His death was only the attestation of His love and service, and His post-resurrection appearances are either spiritual seances or subjective psychological impressions on the minds of the disciples.

The article was so absolutely anti-Christian, and, coming from a Princeton University professor, so scandalous, that it was at once condemned by most of the Presbyterian and other evangelical church papers. Later, Dr. Ottman's criticism of the article appeared in pamphlet form.

Now comes *The Continent*, which after a period of profound silence, has the following:

"The Continent agrees that a university having the history and relations of Princeton ought to be able to fill its Bible chair with a teacher who not only heartily but thrillingly believes in the Bible as God's own book of life and power. Men there

are of the highest and ripest scholarship whose scholarship strikes hands with their reverence and their moral enthusiasm for teaching the Bible as a dynamic of life, and such men are capable of giving the Bible its proper effect in the education of youth. Any university or college which can not find professors of that type to take its Bible courses would better drop its Bible courses altogether. Frigid laboratory dissection of such a warm and palpitating book as the Christian Scriptures is an offense to all moral sensibility and a defeat of the basic aim common to Bible and education alike—character building.

"Nevertheless, *The Continent* is clearly of the opinion that no advance toward the right kind of Bible teaching in universities or colleges will come from assaults on particular teachers done in the sneering and contemptuous satire of Dr. Ottman's pamphlet. For erratic criticism of the Scriptures there is only one effective correction, and that is sane and thoughtful criticism offered in even temper to calm minds. The Church certainly should by this time have learned that rant and railing against heresies serve no purpose but to spread the heresies complained of."

Christian people are required to "hold fast the form of sound words" and to "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints." There are two ways of doing this. One is to interpret the Scriptures in a plain, straightforward way and to obey the commands, or, in other words, to "stand fast" and "contend earnestly."

The other is *The Continent* method, which is to keep quiet when heresy appears and then when some one else assails it to rebuke him for heresy hunting.

This was its method in the Aked controversy which vexed the Church on the Pacific Coast last year. It had no word of condemnation for Dr. Aked's bald infidelity, but only for the Presbyterian ministers who antagonized him. So now its sharpest darts are for those who expose and protest against Professor Miller's false teachings.—*The Herald and Presbyterian*.

#### THE ANSWER!

We suggested in the October CHAMPION that "Princeton might cable to the seat of war and consult either side and learn quickly her duty. She would learn that all true soldiers are like all other honorable men: *They stand for the cause whose uniform they wear.*". The answer to the

cable if ever sent, is undoubtedly suggested by the following telegram published in the *Tribune*, Oct. 1, 1914;

DEATH FOR OFFICERS SUSPECTED OF TREASON.

"Venice (via Paris), Sept. 30.—The captain and all the officers of the Austrian steamer *Radium*, chartered to carry coal for the Austrian navy, have been arrested and summarily shot at Castlenuovo, Dalmatia, on suspicion that they were selling information to French warships regarding the position of mines in the Adriatic."

#### SKEPTICAL TEACHING IN COLLEGES.

Parents will do well to think twice before selecting the college to which they will send their sons. Some of the institutions which were once strongholds of orthodoxy have become infected with the current infidelity. Recently the professor of Biblical Literature in Princeton University has published in the *Biblical World* an article in which he denies two of the fundamental teachings of the New Testament, viz.: the virgin birth of our Lord and His bodily resurrection. He says that Jesus was the son of Joseph. A gentleman of our acquaintance who was preparing to send his son to Princeton, immediately abandoned this plan, and is making arrangements to send the boy to another institution. This example should be followed by all parents who believe in the deity of our Saviour, and who do not wish to have their sons taught infidelity. The most important thing to ascertain about any institution is what it teaches about the fundamentals of the Christian faith. Princeton University has long been cherished as a Presbyterian stronghold. At its head have been men of international reputation, such as Dr. McCosh, Dr. F. L. Patton and President Wilson. The new regime evidently contemplates alliance with "liberalism," which means scouting the authority of the Scriptures as a guide to faith and a record of historical truth.—*The Presbyterian of the South*.

#### KEEPING TAB ON TEXT BOOKS.

We firmly believe that godless education is an enemy of the Church and of society. In schools such education is effected chiefly by non-Christian teachers, but very

seriously by anti-Christian textbooks. One would suppose that in the conservative old State of Virginia the public school authorities would shield the young from the virus and brutality of anti-biblical teaching, but not so. "Tarr's New Physical Geography," now being used in the public schools of Virginia by official authority, teaches that scientists generally agree that the human race is the offspring of brutes. Under the title, "Man and Nature: Development of Mankind," chapter 19, page 369, this passage is found:

"The origin of man is not known, although scientists generally agree that he has developed, by the process of evolution, from some high form of animal. This belief is based upon the close resemblance between the body of man and ape, and receives support from the fact that, in habits and mode of living, some savages are little above animals. But even the least civilized men have powers that no animal possesses, while civilized man is so far above the highest animals that some people believe it impossible that he is the descendant of an animal."

"Whatever man's origin, it is certain that in his early stages he lived the life of a savage. When the Roman Empire was developing the Germans and English were rude savages; and still earlier, the inhabitants of the Italian peninsula were in the same condition. Today, both in the Old and New World, there are races that have not yet risen above savagery."

Here are three propositions that are being taught the children of the State at the expense of the taxpayers, a large percentage of said taxpayers being Christian men and women. One of these propositions is that "man's ancestry is unknown." Now, the Bible tells us that "the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." It also says, "Male and female created he them; and God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth." These and similar passages indicate man's origin and the entire line of his ancestry.

The second statement is: "Scientists generally agree that he (man) has developed, by process of evolution, from some high form of animal." This statement is the product of either dense ignorance, or brazen mendacity. Not only is it not true



that scientists generally agree that man is the product of animal evolution, but scientists of the highest standing reject the Darwinian assumption as untenable. Among these may be named Sir William Dawson, of Canada, successively president of American and British scientific associations, received numerous medals and other honors and was knighted by the British Crown. He is the man who took the wind out of Darwin. Of other eminent scientists we mention Sir Charles Lyell, illustrious in the nineteenth century; the Duke of Argyll, eminent author of "The Reign of Law," "Primeval Man," and other scientific works; Agassiz, the eminent American naturalist, who "opposed Darwinism on scientific grounds; and Sir William Thompson (Lord Kelvin), who was knighted in 1866 and made a peer in 1892.

The British Museum contains the largest single collection of archaeological specimens in the world.

The chief official of that institution says: There is not a specimen in the entire museum that affords the slightest justification for the assumption that the human race has been evolved from brutes. Let it further be noted that a high European authority, a French scientific author, announced a year or two ago that Ernest Haeckel was the only scientist of standing in Germany who still held to the Darwinian theory. Haeckel was first to give prominence to Darwinism in Germany, and now in old age he clings to it, affirms a sordid materialism as his philosophy, and a consequent atheism as his attitude toward religion. Haeckel at least makes his scientific, philosophic and religious views harmonize.

A third statement of Tarr's New Physical Geography, used in the public schools of Virginia, is that man "in his early stages lived the life of a savage." Now, the Bible says: "God created man in his own image; in the image of God created he them." The children in our public schools are taught that in his original state man lived the life of a savage (the author is attempting to account for the origin of the human race), while their Bible teaches them that the first parents of the race were created in the image of God.

We do not know the names of those by whose authority Tarr's book is used in the school. They may be ignorant of its contents. If they have given the children this cup of poison without ascertaining its contents, they are guilty and should reform or resign. If they knew its contents and still imposed upon the children of the State a textbook which repudiates the authority of the Scriptures and insults the cherished faith of the Christian people of the Commonwealth, they are doubly guilty and should confess their sin." —*The Presbyterian of the South*.

#### NORTH CAROLINA ALSO.

Dr. Rolston, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Charlotte, N. C., in a recent sermon turned the tables effectively on the enemies of the Bible in the schools of that State. They had argued that the Christian people had no right to force their views upon the young. He showed that in the physical geography adopted for the schools of the State it is taught that the origin of man is unknown and that scientists agree that he is a being evolved from some higher form of animal life, and then pertinently asked what right unbelievers have to force their views on the Christian youth of the State. It is impossible for a school system to be both secular and religious. It must be the one or the other. —*The Christian Statesman*, October, 1914.

It is a lamentable fact that quite a number of leading educational institutions have become hotbeds of heretical teaching—throttlers of the faith of our youth. The Devil knows quite well how to don a cap and gown and entice with the bait of so-called "modern scholarship." But orthodoxy is beginning to awake from the sleep into which it fell in fancied security, and soon the little skirmishing that is now going on between the assailants and defenders of the faith will grow into a real battle. Then error will be beaten ignominiously from the field and the truth will gloriously triumph.—*New Orleans Christian Advocate*.

*The Devil in Cap and Gown*, by Dr. Ford C. Ottman, is published by A. C. Gaebelien, 456 Fourth Ave., New York City. It can be obtained for 10 cents a copy, \$1.00 a dozen.

## THE CLUB.

### FALSE TEACHERS.

The heaviest anathemas of the Bible seem to be reserved for false teachers, whether the "lying prophets" of the Old Testament, or the "scribes and lawyers" of the New. The only caustic language on our Saviour's lips was uttered in withering rebuke of the Jewish "doctors"; and Paul's ministerial career was a lifelong battle with the Judaizing sectaries of his day, who were their successors. It is noteworthy that all these errorists were opponents of the "faith"; that is, they were skeptical. But the modern doubters only claim to be *inquirers*, forsooth! As if it were the great merit of a public teacher to be uncertain of the topics which he is expected to discuss! Ignorance is a pitiful avowal on their part; but it would be well if they were not so confident and loud-mouthed in publishing it. Better keep their doubts to themselves until they have solved them. One would think they ought to have been well posted and thoroughly convinced on these fundamental points of their profession before they entered upon it, especially as they are but the old topics of the Church in all ages. To them we may justly turn with the cutting retort of Jesus to Nicodemus: "Art thou a master of Israel, and knowest not these things?" A plea is a very feeble excuse for unsettling the faith of young believers and simple souls by their crude inquiries and misdirected investigations.

As a man who casteth fire brands, arrows and death, so is the man that deceiveth his neighbor and saith, "Am not I in sport?" They mean no harm! but they are doing immense harm, and they are an intense scandal to the Christian name besides. Listen again to the words of our common Lord; "But whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea." Wolves in sheep's clothing! It is the old story over again: "Ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth." If the cross-examination now going forward have but the effect to draw them

forth into explicit avowals of their real views, it will not have been in vain. Let none think to hide himself from the public scrutiny by assuming the lofty air of a maligned person. He owes it to himself, to the Church, and to the world, at least to set himself right on the record upon these basal principles, especially if his utterances have been at all dubious, or his position equivocal. In this warfare with error all who are not positively with Christ are virtually and actually against him. "Higher" criticism! indeed! That title is rather a bold assumption on the part of those who are stealthily sapping the basis of all sound doctrine and endeavoring to overthrow the pillars of that sacred edifice in which unsuspecting men have for ages been reposing in the above ground-light of Christian experience. St Paul does not seem to have thought very highly of the "advanced scholarship" of similar parties in his own day who were misleading the Hebrews from their ancestral standards, or he would scarcely have written to them, "For when for the time (that ye have been studying) ye ought to be teachers (fully equipped, and not mere *inquirers*, ye have need that one teach you again (what ye ought to have learned long ago) which be the first principles of the oracles of God." Such students are "advancing backward," and not progressing forward. In plain language, we Methodists would call it *back-sliding*—a genuine scriptural term, too, in honest old Saxon phrase.—*Dr. James Strong, Methodist Review*, March, 1890.

### THE GREAT UNKNOWN.

"What are the results of destructive criticism? That the Biblical records of creation, the fall, and the deluge, are myths, distorted legends, handed down from Babylon or elsewhere, is to it more and more a matter of course. (Besides, it invented the stale theory of the two records, the Jehovistic and the Elohist, which is recently being rehashed in regard to the flood.) The Abraham of the Bible never lived; the Israelites found a chief of this name in the land of Canaan, whom they chose as



their national hero, and their priests saw to the further legendary embellishment. How about Moses, this colossal figure of a single cast, even though viewed only from a psychological standpoint, whose iron law has to this day retained an infrangible power among his people? Well, modern criticism says, smiling, Moses never lived; and Professor Delitzsch puts in his stead 'the priestly scholar, who wrote Genesis i. and anxiously endeavored to eliminate all mythological traits from the Babylonian records of the creation of the world.' He and his books which chronologically come *after* the prophets—at the time in which Moses is supposed to have lived, the Israelites could not write at all (thoroughly refuted by recent discoveries)—are the fabrications of unknown priests, who after the Babylonian captivity felt the need of giving the crushed nation a support. On the whole, the 'great unknown' plays an important part in criticism. Who wrote 'Ecclesiastes'? Of course, Solomon did not, although much in the first chapter agrees verbally with what is otherwise reported of him, and although psychologically the entire book is thoroughly worthy of him. No, an unknown Jewish king, who disappeared without leaving a trace, wrote this mighty mental production much later. And who is Daniel, since in this book it repeatedly stands written 'I Daniel'? Another unknown person, of whom otherwise nothing is known; and my modest surmise that this unknown person might perhaps have been called Daniel, and have been identical with the prophet, does not merit serious consideration. 'Do you really believe,' a learned theologian asked me amazed, 'that there ever lived a man named Daniel? Who wrote Genesis? Who wrote Deuteronomy? Who wrote the Psalms of David, these incomparable lyrics, these effusions of character, of personality? Who wrote the granite prayer of Moses (Ps. xc.)? Who the second part of Isaiah? Who is the author of the books of Ezra and Nehemiah? The unknown! The unknown!' *Better.*

We recall that Artemus Ward when travelling was asked by a fellow traveller, "Do you think Grant will beat Lee?" Ward drawled, "What Lee? Who is Grant?" Another question was about Lincoln. Ward

said, "Lincoln who?" The questioner was silent for a bit and then mustered courage to ask, "Did you ever hear of Adam?" "What was his other name?" inquired Ward.

When a man soberly calls Moses, Daniel, David, and Isaiah, *great unknowns*, think of Artemus and smile. The Church has suffered because her defenders have wasted time discussing settled things with flippant infidels who merely mouth what they heard somebody had said or written.

Just as well try to open the case of the Australian butcher, the Tichborne claimant, settled by a legal decision forty years ago, as to open the case of Isaiah. Not a court in the civilized world but would decide the book is an ancient document, and that it needed nothing to prove its truthfulness but its own contents.

#### IS ARMAGEDDON IMPENDING?

The most acute minds of the world are considering the causes of the Great War. For the most part, they are considering social, political and commercial causes. It might be well not to overlook the spiritual causes in plain view. All thoughtful men are agreed that if the teachings of Jesus as revealed in the Word of God had been made the fundamental principles of Christian statesmanship there would have been no war. Might it not be well to remember as one of the factors of the religious unrest and uncertainty of the times, that belief in the authority of the Bible as the Word of God has been undermined by religious leaders who were pledged to maintain it? Germany and England are chosen by most thinkers as the two nations largely responsible for the outbreak. One demanding unquestioned domination of the sea, the other being charged with a determination to offset the power of its rival by domination of the land. Both countries have been the recognized leaders in the so-called modern movement to discredit the authenticity of the Holy Scriptures. It would be impossible to decide which is the more advanced in its theories or more persistent in their proclamation, and propagation.

THE CHAMPION for over a year has been calling attention to this movement throughout the world, but more especially in Amer-

ica. Articles by able and learned men, quotations from the leading secular and religious press, have called attention to what appeared to be a systematic and concerted conspiracy against the Bible. It has included among its leaders and agents, Great Publishing Houses, Educational Institutions, Boards of Instruction in Religious and Secular Schools, Periodicals, Young Men's Christian Associations, and Pastors of great Pulpits in great Cities.

The method adopted has been strikingly alike in all instances. The children in the public schools as well as in the Sunday schools, the youth in the advanced schools of all classes, the ignorant and untrained masses, have all been assured that the Bible is no longer the Word of God, but it contains the word of god. Modern scholarship has discovered the true method of investigation and interpretation by which the fables, myths, legends, of the Scriptures, have all been labeled; the miraculous incidents and words have been set on one side as doubtful, if not inventions and interpolations. The result has been exactly what might have been expected. Has it been what was deliberately intended?

It does not require a prophet to predict the result if this propaganda is permitted to proceed for a generation more, without a defense worthy of the importance of the interests imperiled. When the world no longer regards the authority of the Scriptures, what will it have in its place? When the Church ceases to base its work upon the divine truths of the Holy Scriptures, what will it have to take its place? Christian consciousness, which we are told is the only authoritative judge as to the divine revelation, will then substitute individual wishes, fancies, delusions, for "Thus saith the Lord." Each individual consciousness being of equal authority with any other or all others, may run riot, and there is no redress. The result will be anarchy, not merely in religion, but in personal living.

After all, the extravaganza of Revelation (xiii.) is not so far-fetched as some pretend to believe. History contains tragedies of nations gone mad, after having banished God from the world and human life, that might well be likened to the world under

the domination of the Beast as the Holy Seer beheld it.

"He opened his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme his name, and his tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven. And it was given unto him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them; and power was given him over all kindreds, and tongues and nations. All that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world.

"And he doeth great wonders, so that he maketh fire come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men. And deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by the means of those miracles which he had power to do. And he causeth all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand or in their foreheads; and that no man might buy or sell, save he had that mark." (Rev. xiii.)

Is it any wonder that, appalled by such Revelation, Pope exclaims:

"Lo: thy dread empire, Chaos, is restored; Light dies before thy uncreating word: Thy hand, great Anarch! lets the curtain fall;

And universal darkness buries all."

Byron's dream of the world without a star or a torch seems tame and commonplace compared with the result of the reign of the Beast. He saw the end and pictured it thus:

The world was void,  
The populous and the powerful was a lump,  
Seasonless, herbless, treeless, manless, lifeless—

A lump of death—a chaos of hard clay."

Armageddon, after all, is only the assured harvest of the seed-sowing of Anarch, which provides the stage for the Rule of the Beast. There are men who can read all this and laugh and jeer. Thoughtful men will ponder well, refuse to be deceived, and unite to cast out the Beast and all that bear his mark or do his will.

No one need tremble for the safety of the Scriptures. They are divine truth, and will withstand, as they have withstood so triumphantly in the past, all possible assaults.  
—Ex.



# "HERESY HUNTERS."

PROF. L. D. WATSON, LL.D.

By way of odium, those who accept the whole Bible and believe in it as the word of God and defend it as such are often called "heresy hunters." It should be remembered that just as reform hunters have been the conservators of sound practice, so heresy hunters have been the conservators of sound doctrine; and Christian civilization is under a lasting debt of gratitude to both of these characters. Heresy hunters have been the saviors of sound doctrine in all the historic dispensation.

1. Abel was a heresy hunter. In the first human family, circumstances point to the fact that the sacrificial idea was the central doctrine and indicated the proper mode of worship. When "Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto the Lord," Abel, the heresy hunter, perceived that his brother was a Unitarian, "and Abel, he also brought of the firstlings of his flock and of the fat thereof. And the Lord had respect unto Abel and to his offering, but unto Cain and to his offering he had not respect."

2. Noah was a heresy hunter. For a long while the Sethites as the "Sons of God" preserved the true doctrine and practice, but Noah discovered the heretical poison in the "daughters of men" and for one hundred and twenty years he labored in the interest of sound doctrine and practice and "by faith Noah, being warned of God of things not seen as yet, moved with fear, prepared an ark to the saving of his house, by the which he condemned the world, and became heir of the righteousness which is by faith."

3. Abraham was a heresy hunter. He was born and educated at Ur of the Chaldees. The patriarchal doctrine was monotheistic, but we learn that Terah and others "served other gods" and were therefore polytheistic in their religion. In his study, Abraham found this was heresy and he accepted the call of God to go out and become the founder of a new and monotheistic nation.

4. Moses was a heresy hunter, and seeing the polytheistic doctrine of the Egyptians, and their corrupt practices, Paul says: "By faith Moses, when he was come

to years refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter, choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season, esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures in Egypt." He accepted the Bible as the word of God.

5. Christ was a heresy hunter and a heresy finder. As a Jew, he was thoroughly conversant with the Old Testament, having been instructed in this book from his youth. He was aware of their heretical traditions, and severely rebuked them for their erroneous opinions, saying: "Thus have ye made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition. Ye hypocrites, well did Isaiah prophesy of you, saying, this people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and honoreth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me. But in vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." "Full well ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your own tradition."

6. The apostle John was a heresy hunter and a heresy destroyer. It was against the unitarian heresy of Cerinthus and others that he wrote his gospel, especially the first chapter.

"Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? He is anti-Christ, that denieth the Father and the Son." "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits, whether they are of God, because many false prophets are gone out into the world." "If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book, and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book."

7. Paul was a heresy hunter and a heresy finder. He was thoroughly educated in the Old Testament Scriptures, and although one of the highest critics, accepted the Bible as the inspired word of God; "believing all things which are written in the law and in the prophets." Acts 24:14.

"Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world and not after Christ." "O Timothy,

keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called, which some professing have erred concerning the faith."

8. Peter was a heresy hunter. "But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction." "Brother Paul also according to the wisdom given unto him hath written unto you, as also in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things; in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction. Ye therefore, beloved, seeing ye know these things before, beware lest ye also, being led away with the error of the wicked, fall from your own steadfastness." A volume might be written to show the effort made by the inspired writers to preserve the doctrinal soundness of "the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints."

"It is undeniable that 'a little learning is a dangerous thing,' in more ways than one, and that one of these things is in encouraging the attitude of mind of a man who quickly outstrips his fellows mentally, and is apt to assume that there is nothing he will not soon be able to understand or explain, from which it is a short flight to denial of the truth of some of the fundamentals of religion. For this, however, hold the man's self-conceit responsible and not Science."—*Prof. Walter W. Bryant, Royal Astronomical Society.*

Some years ago a lady went to consult a famous New York physician about her health. She was a woman of nervous temperament. She gave the doctor a list of her symptoms, and answered his questions only to be astonished at his brief prescription at the end: "Go home and read your Bible an hour a day, then come back to me a month from today." And he bowed her out before she could protest. At first she was inclined to be angry; then she reflected that at least the prescription

was not an expensive one. She went home determined to read conscientiously her neglected Bible. In a month she went back to the doctor's office a different person, and asked him how he knew that was just what she needed. For answer the physician turned to his desk. There worn and marked lay an open Bible. "Madam," he said, "if I were to omit my daily reading of this Book I would lose my greatest source of strength and skill."

The October number of the BIBLE CHAMPION begins by calling "cultured unbelief" the new paganism coming in the "form of an angel of light," and it concludes that the time has come to smite cultured skepticism with cultured faith." Dr. H. W. Magoun discusses "The Virgin Birth and the Divinity of Jesus," Rev. Wm. Holliday charmingly on "The Everlasting Arms," and Prof. L. D. Watson writes with all the force and candor of a learned jurist on "The Bible Legally Established," and so on. It is a hopeful sign of the times that such magazines are published by men of scholarship and recognized Christian character, and that they are supported by multitudes who have grown tired of the rationalistic spirit that would destroy our Bible and our hope. Published by the Bible League, 317 E. 118th street, New York.—*The Methodist Protestant.*

"The established facts of science can never contradict the historical facts at the basis of Christianity. Men of science may or may not be Christians. Their utterances are good for what they are good for. But God is not to be seen through the telescope or microscope; and happily for them, many of the leaders of science in every age have attained to the knowledge of Him through the faith that apprehends Him."—*Sir Alexander R. Simpson, M.D., D.Sc., LL.D.*

It belongs to the nature of the Bible, that it was written for all men of every time, and for all the experiences of each single human heart.

Will you join the Library Club to get or give \$1 or more to place THE CHAMPION in 1,000 Libraries or Reading Rooms? Write now!



## CURRENT COMMENT.

### CONFUSION TO CRITICS OF BIBLE PREDICTED.

Whole World Will Marvel at Revelations of Ancient Life When 15,000 Records are Deciphered, Asserts Minister.

The Rev. Dr. L. W. Munhall, eminent as a Bible scholar in the Methodist Episcopal Church, yesterday predicted that additional translations of the Nippur tablets in the possession of the University of Pennsylvania will bring confusion to the destructive school of Bible critics. He said:

"Only a beginning has been made in the translation of that wonderful library possessed by the University of Pennsylvania. No more than a chapter has ever been written. There are more than 15,000 tablets yet to be deciphered, and I predict that this library will give us information relative to the ancients that will make the whole world marvel.

"That library is of inestimable value. Its acquisition is the greatest accomplishment scored by any institution of learning. The University authorities deserve the highest praise for their enterprise in obtaining it. Professor Hilprecht also deserves praise. Oxford University must come to the University of Pennsylvania to learn."

Doctor Munhall was asked whether the Nippur tablets, containing descriptions of the Creation, the Flood and other incidents recorded in the Book of Genesis, would destroy the value of the Mosaic record as a divine revelation. He replied:

"Certainly not. The fact that a priest in the Temple of Nippur wrote about these things does not interfere with our belief that God revealed them to Moses. On the contrary, these earlier records tend to confirm the things recorded in the Book of Genesis. The Bible critics have sought to discredit Genesis by all sorts of arguments. One was that the art of writing was not understood in Moses' time, and, in consequence, the great law-giver could not have given the world this wonderful record. The Nippur tablets give us convincing proof that the art of writing was understood hundreds of years prior to Moses' time.

These tablets prove that the things Moses wrote about in Genesis must be true since men who lived centuries before Moses wrote concerning them."

A revision of the Book of Genesis and a new conception of the Creation, through

the translation of Nippur tablets at the University of Pennsylvania, is not anticipated by Dr. George A. Barton, professor of Biblical literature and Semitic languages at Bryn Mawr College.

"While it is true," said Doctor Barton, "that Doctor Langdon's translation is of great interest to students of the Sumerian language and to archaeologists, I do not think it will result in any great change in theology. I regard it merely as an addition to the variety of early forms which the story of the Creation took."—*Public Ledger*, Philadelphia.

### A GOOD ONE ON THE HIGHER CRITICS.

One of the most striking characteristics of skeptical scientists and theologians is that, while trying to eliminate the supernatural from the Christian religion and the Holy Scriptures, they exhibit a credulity that far surpasses that of any adherent of the orthodox faith. As an illustration of the gullibility of the "critics" and of what weight may be safely attached to their noisily paraded views, we take the following from the *BIBLE CHAMPION* (New York)—a periodical which all our preachers and leading laymen ought to take and read:

"Let me tell you a story. There came out in Germany a book entitled 'Romans Dissected.' It purported to have been written by one Professor McRealsham. The name suggests a Germanized Scotchman. Critical analysis shows four well-marked divisions, or sources, from which the Bible book was compiled. In one, Christ is spoken of as Jesus Chirst, which would give a J C document; in another as Christ Jesus, which would give the document C J; in another He is spoken of as God, but as this was subdivided for an alleged sufficient reason, there were yielded the documents G 1 and G 2. Thus there were derived G 1, G 2, J C and C J. The evidence was presented in minute detail, and the demonstration seemed complete—as perfect as that for any Pentateuchal analysis. The 'scholars' bit. The book was hailed with delight, and it was declared to mark a great step in the progress of

higher criticism. In a second edition it was translated into English, and the facts came out. And who is Professor McReals-ham? He is the late Professor Charles M. Mead of the Hartford (Conn.) Theological Seminary. He wrote the book as a take off, a Joke, to show the absurdity, the groundlessness, of the claims of the higher criticism. It was a real sham. His achievement was a fine exhibition of what 'learned ingenuity and a lively imagination' can do."  
—*New Orleans Christian Advocate*.

### ARE MIRACLES CREDIBLE?

In determining the credibility of miracles, we need to consider the occasion, the nature of the miracle and the worker. The miracles of Jesus have a fit occasion, a great human need. In estimating them we are not to think about the possibility or credibility of a miracle in the abstract; we are rather to think of what we should reasonably expect on the part of a loving God in relation to men made in His image who are in the toils of sin and suffering. The occasion of Christ's miracles is no less an occasion than the need of redemption. The miracles of the Gospels are of the nature that fits this occasion. They reveal God's love; they bring God's love into touch with man's woes. Most of the miracles of Jesus were miracles of healing, not of nervous troubles only, but of leprosy, fevers and various other diseases. Nor were they confined to healings; in three instances they were the raising of the dead to life. In every instance, save possibly the blighting of the fig tree, they came straight from the heart of God for the relief of human woe, and even the apparent exception of the fig tree is not a real exception, for it was a solemn warning, a parable in act, with a kindly purpose. Another characteristic of the Gospel miracles is that they fit the character of the worker, the unique and transcendent Christ. They are worthy of the divine Redeemer; they flow naturally from the person of Christ. Christ Himself is the supreme miracle.—*Worcester's Professor of Philosophy*.

### A CRITICAL TIME.

If there ever was a time for men who believe in the gospel to get together it

is now. There need be no uncertainty as to the issue before us or the outcome of the battle. The rationalistic element in all our churches will go out from us unwillingly and under protest, just as they did in Germany, France, Switzerland, England and New England. And when they go they will take with them the millions given for endowment of evangelical institutions. But the Bible-loving remnant in all these churches will close up their ranks and, in reduced numbers but not with reduced courage, they will stand for the old faith. They will plant new churches, new schools, new seminaries and new missions, just as they have done in all these other countries, and "the old, old gospel of Jesus and his love," the gospel of lost sinners saved by atoning grace, will not perish.—*Presbyterian Examiner*.

### GOD'S WORD ABIDES.

It is a most remarkable thing that the age in which the accuracy of the Book has been most sharply questioned and most hotly assailed has been also the period of archaeological discovery which has yielded most numerous and signal and unexpected confirmations of biblical statements.

Within the last few weeks another great "find" of costly gems, beautifully cut and engraved, and coming from a period far earlier than Moses, has been an added and crushing answer to the charge long ago made by Professor Von Bohlen, and vociferously repeated by lesser critics, that gems could not be cut and engraved in the time of Moses, as narrated in the book of Exodus in its account of the high priest's breastplate.

One by one the numerous alleged mistakes are shown by actual discovery to be no mistakes at all, but accurate records of fact. Why it is that the repeated and striking vindication of the Scriptures at points apparently most difficult and hopeless, does not raise in the minds of rational rationalists and critics the presumption of its reliability on the remaining points passes our comprehension. It can be safely affirmed that not one mistake which may not be fairly ascribed to copyists and put in the class which in modern phrase we call typographical er-



rors, has ever been proved against the Holy Book. Scores and scores of supposed errors have been shown by modern research to be just the reverse. And the faith of our fathers who trusted in the Bible in its darkest days, with a confidence at once pathetic and sublime, has been abundantly justified. Its loyal and devoted readers may triumphantly declare concerning the sacred volume what it has so beautifully predicted concerning them: "No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper; and every tongue that shall rise against thee in judgment thou shalt condemn."—*Christian Observer*.

Dr. Washington Gladden is opposed to the present prohibition movement in Ohio. He says:

"I am no more in favor of it than I am of putting creeds into the trust deeds of churches or theological seminaries. More light and larger experience may make the people of next year more competent than we are to deal with such questions. My faith in progress is such that I am quite unwilling to resort to any methods which will hinder the free action of those who will come after me."

Just think of it. If one would give money to endow the preaching of the Gospel or the teaching of Gospel theology, let him give it without conditions, for next year some one may find a better religion than the Gospel. If he is against the liquor traffic let him oppose prohibition, because next year some one may find a better way of prohibiting the liquor traffic than by prohibiting it. As to "hindering the free action of those who will come after" us, the laws against theft, violence, the sale of poisons, adultery, etc., do just this. It is necessary to restrict the free action of those who would do wrong to the injury of others.—*The Herald and Presbyterian*.

#### ATTACK IS THE BEST DEFENSE.

The Emperor Trajan was once remonstrated with by some of the Roman senators for employing the resources of the empire in the conquest of peoples so remote from Rome. He was told that all the nation's resources were needed to hold in subjection the provinces that had already been conquered. The Emperor replied that it was for the sake of holding what they had

that the new conquests had been undertaken; "for," said he, "if Rome's legions ever conclude that their work is done and that there are no more lands to conquer, they will be unable to maintain their rule where it is now firmly established." Alexander the Great wept because there were no more worlds for him to conquer, but his successors, so impressed with the magnificence of his achievements and the grandeur of their own inheritance, were unable to hold even a part of what had been given them.—*Rural Manhood*.

#### THE POWER OF TRUTH.

The *Canadian Churchman*, relates the following incident: A certain prominent and well-educated Hindu was appointed by the Benares Brahmins as a lecturer, to counteract the influence of the Christian missionaries. When waiting at a railway station for a train to take him to a place where he was to lecture, he bought a Bible. He became more and more interested as he pursued his study of it, and it ended in his giving up his lecturing, so convinced was he that Christianity was after all the true religion. So it has come to pass that this influential man is now selling at his own expense, copies of the very Book against which he proposed to lecture. Truly, "the Word of God is living and powerful."

What right has the Church to send forth men into its ministry who blue pencil the Bible? The time is coming when such men will have a very small following in the Churches and the people will desire ministers who receive the solemn affirmations of the Bible and are willing and glad to declare them. The makers of interrogation marks in the pulpit are being fast numbered in this country. The people are not going to be fooled by any pretense of higher education and better scholarship. The Bible is good enough for them and that they are going to have and hold to.—*Wesleyan Christian Advocate*.

Will you join the Library Club to get or give \$1 or more to place THE CHAMPION in 1,000 Libraries or Reading Rooms? Write now!

## EDITOR'S WHAT NOT.

### WHO IS DEUTERO-ISAIAH?

PROF. G. FREDERICK WRIGHT, LL.D.

He is a myth, spun out of the irresponsible brains of German critics, whose fundamental principle is that there is no such thing as actual prophecy. According to them, Cyrus could not have been mentioned a hundred years before he came into being. That this rejection of prophecy is the *a priori* reason for postulating a second Isaiah, living after the time of Cyrus, is evident from the weakness of all their other arguments.

First, there is nothing in the style of Isaiah xl. to lxvi. to separate it from the first part of the book. Tennyson, who is good authority of style, gave it as his opinion that so far as style is concerned the book bears indisputable marks of the same author. In the words used there is no evidence of a later date for the second half of the book. The second Isaiah is so like the first in its use of words and figures that one is indistinguishable from the other. There has never been any other such duplications of personality as the critics suppose to have been the case here.

Secondly, the weakness of the argument for a Deutero-Isaiah appears in the latter conclusions of the critics that there were *ten* different Isaiahs in the first part of the book. To be abreast of the times one must now speak, according to these critics, not of the *second* Isaiah as the author of the last twenty-six chapters, but of the *eleventh* Isaiah.

In view of that prophetic exaltation of mind which has given us the description of Christ and his work in the 53d of Isaiah, we ought not to find it difficult to accept everything else in the book on its face value. As some one has humorously remarked, "If the last chapters were not written by the historical Isaiah, they were written by another man of the same name and prophetic insight." What is the use of palming off upon our Sunday School scholars these phantoms of German criticisms as if they were scientifically ascertained facts?

### TO THE READERS OF THE CHAMPION

Dear Friends:—

In the October CHAMPION we submitted a Report to Patrons with a Postscript to our Readers. The friends of the Bible League have done wonders in co-operating with us in restoring the League to leadership in maintaining the Bible as the Word of God. I have left nothing undone within my power. By providing rent free and doing without a stenographer, expenses have been reduced to a minimum. We have left only printing and postage, about \$275 a month. This amount must be in hand the first of each month to insure continuance. THE CHAMPION is a necessity; it must not stop. When it stops—all stops.

We were so uncertain about the subscriptions owing to the break-down in the office from the long illness and retirement of the former Secretary, we did not dare discontinue those who appeared to be in arrears lest we might do them an injustice. If we could collect all dues and insure the habit of paying all subscriptions in advance, we would be relieved of all care and anxiety. This letter is sent to all whose subscriptions expire in 1914, or earlier. If each could send at least One Dollar, it would lift our burden. The times are distressing and everybody is pinched. Will you not deny yourself a little more and aid in keeping the work going? Will you not interest others and secure their aid? Will you not answer by return mail?

Yours faithfully,

Jay Benson Hamilton.

### VAUDEVILLE DIALECTICS

We enjoyed a rare experience recently. The Annual Meeting of the New York District Ministers' Association of the New York East Conference (Methodist Episcopal), was held October 12, at Bridgeport, Conn. Prof. Charles Foster Kent, Yale University, delivered an Address on "The Minister's Great Source Book." The speaker is the author of a large number of books teaching the most extreme Destruc-



tive Criticism. His most ambitious work is "The Historical Bible" of six volumes. We reviewed it in the January CHAMPION.

Prof. Kent is not an orator. He is a very interesting talker and treats his audience as if they were his class in the school-room. This gives him the advantage of stating things without argument or evidence. What he says, *goes*, not because it is true, but because he says it; it must be true for he has said it. The only safe condition for this style of discussion is to have an audience, like the class, ignorant of the subject, and on hand to be taught by one who knows.

The Professor has a pleasing personality. His eye is keen. and has a sparkle which at times becomes dangerously near a twinkle. His smile is beaming and attractive, but has the tendency when he is in action to become a trifle tense, and almost cynical. We took enough notes to be assured that he was keeping fairly well within the boundaries fixed by the "Historical Bible."

The first impression created by the address was an added respect for the Wisdom of the Wise man, who said "There is no new thing under the sun. Is there a thing whereof it may be said: See, this is new, it hath been long ago, in the ages which were before us." (Eccles. i, 9-10). We hurried along with the running stream of Modern Scholarship as it illustrates the assumed results of the Modern Mind and remembered that for most of the product we were indebted to Julian, Celsus, Porphyry and Astruc. Since those Anaks, we have had little but reiterations and amplifications of the teachings of the Scientists of the days of the early church. Then as now, they depended largely, if not wholly, upon statement without argument or evidence. When pressed for the origin of their declared truth, it proved to be their own invention. Leadership then as now, depended mostly upon ability to *perceive*, which is only the manly boast of possession of woman's prerogative, the ability to *know* without telling why.

The address can be summarized in a single paragraph. The product of the investigation and discovery by Destructive Critics in all Biblical matters is the assured result of Modern Scholarship. If you care

to know all that statement means, you have only to secure a copy of "The Historical Bible" and you will possess it in full. Prof. M'Giffert of Union Theological Seminary has a book entitled "Before Kant." We felt as if we ought to have an address on "After Kent." What was left of "The Minister's Source Book," after Prof. Kent had concluded? Instead of a rushing, gushing, exhaustless fountain, it made as sorry an exhibit as the famous "cupboard of Mother Hubbard." The seeking minister would fare like the hungry dog, which looked in vain to find a single bone.

We wondered if when the speaker had offered his farewell in graceful words and taken his departure, the twinkle of the eye did not return to stay and the lips did not grow tense with an unconcealed cynical smile, to yield soon to a pucker of wonder and amazement. Would it be ungracious to suggest that possibly the wonder might induce a merry whistle of a modern adaptation of that strain from Puck, "What fools these Methodists be!"

The Professor is too thoroughly informed to imagine that the Articles of Religion of Methodism have been changed; or the conditions of admission to membership in the Church and the Ministry have been amended. He would not need to be told that every man before him had given a pledge with all the sanctity of an oath, to maintain the authenticity and integrity of all the canonical books of the Scripture "*of whose authority there was never any doubt in the church.*"

We have but to remind our readers of two truths taught by Professor Kent which we stated in the BIBLE CHAMPION, January, 1914. He abolishes Christmas and Easter. By his intuition he perceives the "oldest record" of the Birth and Boyhood of Jesus is found in Luke ii, 1-7; first half of 21; 40-52; a total of twenty and one half verses. The Resurrection as recorded in the "earliest and most direct testimony" is not to be sought in the Gospel story. It is only found in I. Corinthians, xv, 1-8. The "Historical Bible" as "The Ministers' Source Book" contains nothing for Christmas or Easter but these two fragments. In the light of this fact, is it not too dignified to term such Dialectics, *Vaudeville?*

## THE MOSAIC AUTHORSHIP OF THE PENTATEUCH

REV. JOHN H. RAVEN, D. D.

*Professor of Old Testament Language and Exegesis.*

Theological Seminary, New Brunswick, N.J.

This paper, read before the Methodist Ministers' Meeting, New York City, October 26, 1914, will be published in the *BIBLE CHAMPION*, December and January. This is a scholarly, convincing, and most impressive address. It most clearly and forcibly maintains the Historical Argument for Mosaic Authorship of the Pentateuch. Any minister sending ten cents (coin or stamps) will be entered as a special subscriber for these two months and thus obtain this and a number of other very able articles.

---

## THE BIBLE CHAMPION

Bible League of North America, 317 E. 118th St., New York City.

"This magazine is all that its name claims. It does not fail to be at any moment or on any page or paragraph a champion. If the enemy does not appear for it to try its valor on, it hunts him up and holds him forth upon its spear. If a man wants to see the defensive side and become acquainted with the defenders of the faith, he can do so by reading this magazine. This might do some men a little good, and relieve them of the feeling they have that the stalwart defenders of the faith have all passed away. The present number is filled with discussions that will enlighten all readers."—*Western Christian Advocate*.

---

## THE ISAIAH TWINS.

"The double" is no novelty in literature or history. In "The Comedy of Errors," the two Dromios, twin brothers, through close personal likeness, were able to appear as one person in the play. Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, although but one person, assumed distinct personalities at will, so that by the changes each had his "double." Arthur Orton, an Australian butcher, claimed to be Sir Roger Charles Tichborne and demanded his title and property. He was

non-suited in 1871, but in 1873 was convicted of perjury and sentenced to fourteen years' penal servitude.

It would not be strange if this device should be adopted by the assailants of the Bible. We will consider at this time only "The Isaiah Twins." It is necessary in beginning to regard the transaction as not a mere comedy of errors, but rather as a deliberate crime. It is a piece of wilful wickedness, in most particulars a copy of the scheme of the pseudo Sir Roger Tichborne. Infidel scholars, determined to leave nothing undone, and no plan untried to overthrow the authority of the Word of God, have not hesitated to stoop to the ways and methods of the criminal. Elsewhere in this number we have told in brief the story of the invention and development of "the double" theory. There was no pretense of honesty or righteousness or fairness. It was merely an infidel's trick to deceive the ignorant or the unwary. Then later it was taken up by the broad-minded Christian scholar as a matter to be considered, to establish the truthfulness of the Holy Book. To-day we have passed through all of these stages of suspicion, arraignment, investigation, and have the assured result proclaimed as something that has not "impoverished" us, but is rather an "enrichment." We have preferred to have the case stated by an eminent scholar of yesterday in the words which he used in the *Methodist Review*, March, 1890 (page 159). In brief, the external testimony is overwhelming. Not a whisper or suspicion of "the double" is to be found, in any ancient writer; the Jews of all ages, including Jesus and his disciples, give no intimation of knowledge of "the double." Religious teachers and scholars of the highest grade have treated it as a single book by one author. No manuscript or version exists which countenances "the double." It stands in every canon, ritual and service volume an entire and complete unit without any mark whatever to indicate even the suspicion of the authenticity of the book or any part of it. As there are no internal evidences worthy of notice in face of the external testimony we have a right to ask—Why this pertinacity through all these centuries to establish this "double" theory?



Dr. Strong answers the query: "It is evidently for the very purpose of invalidating the authority of the latter chapters that the theory has been propounded. The skeptical spirit has taken offense at their explicitness, especially in predicting the very name of Cyrus and the passion of Christ; and seeks to destroy this clinching proof of inspiration and religious doctrine."

#### THE YOUNG MEN'S INFIDEL ASSOCIATION.

THE CHAMPION, in May, 1914, contained an editorial entitled "Y. M. C. A. or Y. M. I. A.?" It contained the following paragraph:

"There are two offenses equally dastardly and criminal; one is to teach infidel doctrines in an Evangelical Sunday School; the other is to lead astray in a similar manner, young men in the Y. M. C. A. New York City not long since had a phenomenal financial campaign, by which \$4,000,000 was raised for Association work for men and women. No one would have had the hardihood to announce or conduct such a campaign, if the avowed object and purpose of the use of the funds was to destroy the faith of young people in the integrity and authority of the Scriptures."

Through the courtesy of Rev. George E. Barber, D.D., pastor of the 18th Street Methodist Episcopal Church in this city, we have been favored with a copy of a typewritten manuscript of outlines of talk on Christianity and Modern Thought given by Burt B. Farnsworth at Twenty-third Street Y. M. C. A. We quote elsewhere in this number from this manuscript. This selection will be followed by others in future numbers, that our readers may know the kind of religious teaching which is offered young men in the Y. M. C. A. of this city. The secretary is reported to us as a member of the Grace Methodist Episcopal Church in this city, and a teacher of a Bible class in the Sunday School. The manuscript appears to be a transcript of the teaching of Counterfeit Critics, which masquerades under the name of Modern Thought. In many statements it is only a feeble echo of Ingersoll, Paine, and other infidel enemies of the Scriptures. Is it not time for the Evangelical Christian

Church of this city and nation to take up the petition, "How long, O Lord, how long?"

#### INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION, Y. M. C. A.

Portland, 1869.

"Resolved, That, as these organizations bear the name of Christian, and profess to be engaged directly in the Saviour's service, so it is clearly their duty to maintain the control and management of all their affairs in the hands of those who profess to love and publicly avow their faith in Jesus, the Redeemer, as Divine, and who testify their faith by becoming and remaining members of churches held to be Evangelical. And we hold those churches to be Evangelical which, maintaining the Holy Scriptures to be the only infallible rule of faith and practice, do believe in the Lord Jesus Christ (the only begotten of the Father, King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, in whom dwelleth the fulness of the Godhead bodily, and who was made sin for us, though knowing no sin, bearing our sins in his own body on the tree) as the only name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved from everlasting punishment and to life eternal." (Italics added by vote of International Convention, Indianapolis, 1893.)

#### THE BIBLIOTHECA SACRA.

*The Bibliotheca Sacra* is to be congratulated upon its long and brilliant career. It has no superior in the character of the subjects treated, and for the intellectual ability and literary rank of its contributors. The editor, G. Frederick Wright, LL.D., alone, is enough to make the Quarterly one of the foremost leaders of the world in the realm which has commanded the interest and labor of his whole life. THE BIBLE CHAMPION is not only highly honored, but greatly favored in entering upon its work under the new name and under the direction of its new Board of Directors in being associated with *The Bibliotheca Sacra*. All new subscribers to *The Bibliotheca Sacra* may secure both magazines for one year for \$3.00. This should be paid in advance and sent to THE BIBLE CHAMPION.

## INFIDEL HYSTERIA ABOUT ISAIAH.

When we read in evangelical periodicals that Isaiah only wrote half his prophecy and some "great unknown" wrote the other half, *we smile*. The writer is only a belated retailer of infidel slanders of over a quarter of a century ago. Dr. Strong, in his article in *The Methodist Review*, March, 1800, gave this footnote from Delitzsch's *Commentary on Isaiah*, 1, 57.

"The critical treatment of Isaiah commenced as follows: It began with the second part. Koppe first of all expressed some doubt as to the genuineness of the whole; and Justi, followed by Eichorn, Paulus, and Bertholdt, raised this suspicion into firm assurance that the whole was spurious. The result thus obtained could not possibly continue without reaction upon the first part. Rosenmuller, who was always dependent upon his predecessors, was the first to question whether the oracle against Babylon, in chap. xiii.-xiv. 23, was really Isaiah's, as the heading affirms; and to his great relief Justi and Paulus undertook the defense of his position. Further progress was now made. With the first oracle against Babylon in chap. xiii.-xiv. 23, the second, in chap. xxi. 1-10, was also condemned; and Rosenmuller was justly astonished when Gesenius dropped the former but maintained that the argument with regard to the latter was inconclusive. There still remained the oracle against Tyre, in chap. xxiii., which might either be left as Isaiah's or attributed to a younger unknown prophet, according to the assumption that it predicted the destruction of Tyre by Assyrians or by Chaldeans. Eichhorn, followed by Rosenmuller, decided that it was not genuine. But Gesenius understood by the destroyers the Assyrians; and, as the prophecy consequently did not extend beyond Isaiah's horizon, he defended its authenticity. Thus the Babylonian series was set aside, or, at any rate, pronounced thoroughly suspicious. But the keen eyes of the critics made still further discoveries. Eichhorn found a play upon words in the cycle of predictions in chaps. xxiv.-xxvi., which was unworthy of Isaiah. Gesenius detected an allegorical announcement of the fall of Babylon. Consequently, they both condemned these three chapters;

and it had its effect, for Ewald transferred them to the time of Cambyses. Still shorter work was made with the cycle of predictions in chapters xxxiv., xxxv., on account of their relations to the second part. Rosenmuller pronounced them, without reserve, 'a song composed in the time of the Babylonian captivity, when it was approaching its termination.' This is the true account of the origin of the criticism upon Isaiah. It was in the swaddling clothes of rationalism that it attained its maturity. Its first attempts were very juvenile. The names of its founders have been almost forgotten. It was Gesenius, Hitzig and Ewald who first raised it to the eminence of a science."

No one can read such a scandalous exhibition of audacity and irreverence without becoming hot with indignant anger. It may be a question which was the more guilty of blasphemy, the infidels who vivisected Isaiah, or the Christian scholars who permitted it. There can be no claims that the infidels were scholars, or were influenced with an honest purpose to ascertain the truth. They never missed an opportunity to give the truth the seeming of untruth, and where no such opportunity appeared, without a single scruple they manufactured it. All this fraud and forgery has been proclaimed and proven hundreds of times. No argument worthy the name has ever been offered in its behalf. What can be said of the pseudo-Christian scholarship that will now repeat as if it were an established result of scholarship the blatant boast of the conscienceless infidels, dead, dishonored, and ——?

## CAPTAIN GULLIVER REDIVIVUS.

Jolly old salt, we get occasional glimpses of him as he relates for the edification of the gullibles, the latest marvels of his wonderful adventures. He has given us two wonders in *The Methodist Review*, September, 1914. One is a stupendous discovery; the other is a startling exposure of fraud.

"We are not impoverished by the discovery of two Isaiahs. We should be enriched could we find ten in place of two. Not one of them would be less because we had discovered more." p. 732.



Substitute Washington or Lincoln for Isaiah, and see how simple a thing it is to increase the number of our immortals to any desired number and yet diminish the glory or fame of none.

"The contention for the historicity of the story of Jonah borders on blasphemy. That God singled out this one traveler by sea to be the subject of the Divine care in contradiction to his way of caring for all who travel by land or sea is an outrage to the Christian consciousness of the Divine. God cares for all. Whether they are vomited ashore or drowned in the deep they are cared for by God." p. 733. Is Gulliver also among the Prophets? That is his funniest adventure of all.

His two discoveries are as veracious as those among the Lilliputs, the Struldbrugs, or Houyhnhnms. It is impossible to deal seriously with a joke. Especially one like that of the impulsive Irishman who knocked down a Jew for crucifying Christ. His excuse for the lateness of his vengeance was that he had only heard of the crime that day. We deal elsewhere with this revival of an exploded infidel humbug of a quarter of a century ago, about the Isaiah Twins. We wonder that our staid *Review* could give space to it. It has few readers of the class that bite so easily, of whom Knickerbocker said, "So golden a conjecture . . . was too tempting not to be immediately snapped at by the gudgeons of learning."

### JESUS THE BLASPHEMER

We have referred above to Gulliver on Isaiah. The reference to Jonah merits a separate but brief note.

THE CHAMPION in September and October, 1913, treated the story of Jonah in

special articles which awakened great attention and interest. In brief it was shown that the Book of Jonah was an Ancient Document, which needed nothing to prove its truthfulness but its own contents. The legal principle which thus establishes it, has been accepted by all civilized Courts for hundreds of years.

*"The contention for the historicity of the story of Jonah borders on blasphemy."*

The only "contention for historicity" of which we have any knowledge is the reference of Jesus in which he likens it to his death, burial and resurrection.

"An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given to it, but the sign of the prophet Jonas: For as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly; so shall the son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth. The men of Nineveh shall rise in judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it; because they repented at the preaching of Jonas; and behold, a greater than Jonas is here." Matt. xii., 39-41.

The New Standard Dictionary defines *as*, thus: "expressing comparison, proportion, and equality;" Ill. "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as (thou lovest) thyself." It is unthinkable that Jesus seeking for an illustration of his death, burial and resurrection would select anything *less truthful*. In his speech one incident was exactly as historical as the other. He adds a further historic fact by saying: "Nineveh repented at the preaching of Jonas." This was a greater marvel than the fish story. It is a queer condition of mind that will try to get rid of an objectionable fact by accusing Jesus of *fooling* or *blasphemy* in relating it.

## COUNTERFEIT CRITICISM OF THE SCRIPTURES

Rev. Jay Benson Hamilton, D.D.

*Address Before the Methodist Ministers, New York City.*

36 pages, paper, sent post-paid, 10 cents.

"As a clear setting forth within a short compass of the dangers of Higher Criticism and the attitude of Methodism, properly interpreted toward it, we have seen nowhere any discussion that will at all compare with this one."—*New Orleans Christian Advocate*.

"The author's text is 'Show us,' and it will be seen that he does not preach from the text, but sticks closely to it. The address is up-to-date and is among the best, if not the very best, paper of its kind and purpose we have seen. It is clear, concise, cogent, complete, conclusive, and should have a wide circulation."—*Prof. L. D. Watson, LL.D.*

## THE LIBRARY TABLE.

### WHO IS DEUTERO-ISAIAH?

The Book Table of the *New York Christian Advocate*, October 1, reviewing *The Beacon Lights of Prophecy*,\* by Dr. Albert C. Knudson, of Boston University School of Theology, said: "It is a practical and thoroughly spiritual interpretation of Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Deutero-Isaiah. While questions of literary criticism are largely ignored . . . the main conclusions of biblical scholarship are assumed or stated without discussion."

In the chapter on "Isaiah the Prophet of Faith," the opening paragraph is as follows:

"The book of Isaiah has been one of the chief battle-fields of modern criticism. The struggle is now over. It is at present generally agreed that a large—indeed, the larger—part of the book is not the work of Isaiah, the son of Amoz. But this fact has not materially detracted from the significance which through the ages has attached to him. He is still the greatest of prophets."

We quote from the chapter on "Deutero-Isaiah, the Prophet of Universalism":

"Amos and Hosea, as we have seen, owe much of their present distinction to the work of modern critics. But the debt of Deutero-Isaiah to this source is, in a sense, still greater. The very knowledge of his existence is a modern discovery. For some reason or through some circumstance, his prophecies came to be attached to the book of Isaiah and to be regarded as a part of the work of the great prophet of the eighth century. This was the view of Jesus the son of Sirach (Eccles. xlviii. 22), who lived about B. C. 200. It was also the opinion universally held until a little over a century ago."

"The arguments which have led modern scholars to assign Isaiah xl. to lxvi. to another and later prophet are partly literary, partly theological, and partly historical. The language and style of the two parts of the book differ so widely from each other that they can hardly have emanated

from the same person. The same is also to be said of the theological ideas. And the historical conditions presupposed in the latter part of the book require us to believe that the author must have lived about one hundred and fifty years after the time of Isaiah."

"The date of Deutero-Isaiah appears to be definitely fixed by the historical references in his prophecies. Cyrus is on the scene. Babylon is about to fall. The Jewish exiles are soon to go free. Shortly, then, before the fall of Babylon, in B. C. 538, must, it would seem, have been the date of Deutero-Isaiah's ministry."

Without entering into a discussion of the "conclusions of biblical scholarship which are assumed or stated without discussion," we add a few notes as suggestions.

1. In "Infidel Hysteria About Isaiah," page 182, we give as selected by Dr. Strong, a quotation from Delitsch. It shows how this invention of a Double Isaiah was a scheme of infidel enemies of the Scriptures concocted without the faintest shadow of evidence. The invention is now declared to be the conclusion of biblical scholarship, without evidence or even argument as surely a settled question.

2. In "Not Two Isaiahs," page 159, we give Dr. Strong's scholarly discussion of the reasons offered for "the duplex authorship." No man in the denomination before or since his time was better fitted to examine and analyze this infidel invention. His conclusion was that there was no ground for the claim and gravely asserted that the whole invention had an ulterior purpose. "It is evidently for the purpose of invalidating the authority of the latter chapter that the theory has been expounded. The skeptical spirit has taken offense at their explicitness in predicting the very name of Cyrus and the passion of Christ; and seeks to destroy this clinching proof of inspiration and religious doctrine."

3. Lange's Commentary says of the attempt to fix the date of the Deutero-Isaiah at one hundred and fifty years after the time of Isaiah:

\*Published by the Methodist Book Concern, New York.



"Let us suppose the author of these chapters (xl-lxvi.) to have been a contemporary of Cyrus, and to have only feigned this prophecy, then it would be but a worthless comedy. This would-be prophet was then an impostor that blasphemously abused the name of God. For if Cyrus was already there, and all that Isaiah prophesies of him had already happened, or at least was at the point of taking place, then that argument wholly lacks foundation. Then Jehovah does not prophesy, but an impostor pretends to prophesy in His name, things that in fact were not future but past. The pretended prophecy, then, would be a product, not of the Holy Spirit of truth, but of the spirit of lying. If any would assume that the pretended prophet still meant only to attain a good thing by morally objectionable means, that, therefore, his fraud was a pious fraud, then nothing is gained thereby. A truly pious Israelite could not possibly have been willing to prop his faith in Jehovah by means which Satan, Jehovah's enemy, uses to gain his ends—by lies! But a man who is capable of desecrating God's name by gross lies cannot at the same time be interested to have God's name sanctified. . . . Can the author of a fictitious prophecy of Cyrus, seven times repeated, be at the same time the interpreter of the holiest of all of the divine revelation?"

4. The Articles of Religion of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Par. 5, names the Canonical Books of the Old and New Testaments, "*of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church.*" This list does not contain *Deutero-Isaiah*. The General Conference cannot change the Articles of Religion, even by a unanimous vote. It certainly cannot be done by an individual Methodist, however great his learning or high his position.

5. The General Conference of 1912 ordered "That those who are in charge of our official publications should consistently adhere to a cautious and wise policy during these times of unrest. Such a policy should include the avoidance of unsettled questions so far as is consistent with honesty in teaching. If tentative views are set forth, they should be plainly labeled 'tentative.' Care should be taken to keep the teachings of our literature in harmony with

the fundamental doctrines of Evangelical Christianity and the standards of doctrine of the Methodist Episcopal Church." It would seem as if this were so specific as not to be misunderstood by any one. It need hardly be said it includes in its "order" professors in our denominational schools, especially those to which is committed the training of the future ministry. It also is an "order" to the Methodist Book Concern with regard to the books it issues under its name, thus committing the denomination to the doctrines they contain.

#### THE CHAMPION IN ONE THOUSAND LIBRARIES.

We have suggested several times the advisability of getting THE CHAMPION into Reading Rooms and Public Libraries. A few are subscribed for by reading rooms; quite a number have been paid for by individuals for this purpose. We know of no way by which our readers can with so little effort or so little money secure such a wide hearing for The Bible League as to place THE CHAMPION in a reading room, where a single copy can be read by scores of people. A patron who has been a generous supporter of the League offers \$50 to place THE CHAMPION in as many public libraries. We solicit our readers in all towns and cities where a reading room is maintained in connection with a school, library, or association, to solicit the managers to subscribe for our magazine and put it on their table for their patrons. Where they are unwilling to do this, secure permission to have us place it there free, and give us promptly name and address. Then find some one who will provide the dollar. All who prefer to have us attend to securing places are requested to send One Dollar or more. We will give them the name of the library to which their CHAMPION goes. If One Thousand Libraries can be opened immediately for this purpose it will advance our cause immeasurably. Will you not help by giving, or getting, \$1 to establish the \$1,000 Library Fund at once? Write!

Will you join the Library Club to get or give \$1 or more to place THE CHAMPION in 1,000 Libraries or Reading Rooms? Write now!

# Scientific Confirmations of Old Testament History

By G. FREDERICK WRIGHT, D.D., LL.D., F.G.S.A.

450 pages, 12mo. \$2.00, net

"A second reading of this most timely and really beautifully written book has very greatly increased our admiration for it."—*Canadian Churchman*.

"For a long time to come every one who has to write upon the Deluge, or touch that wider subject of the attitude of the Old Testament to the phenomena of nature, will require to know what is written in this book."—*The Expository Times*.

"This volume bids fair to be recognized as the standard work on the important subject of Pentateuchal physics."—Professor G. MACLOSKIE in *The Princeton Theological Review*.

"No thoughtful mind—no sincere searcher for the truth—can give due consideration to the vast accumulation of scientific facts arranged by the author in this volume and fail to be confirmed in a belief of the accuracy of the historical statements of the Old Testament."—*The Churchman* (London).

"The book is of interest because it shows how wonderfully the account given of the Creation in Genesis harmonizes with the scientific data in regard to the different stages of creation and evolution."—*Dublin Express*.

"The appearance of Dr. Wright's book at the present juncture is extremely opportune. . . . Archæology came to the defence of the Bible a generation ago; we believe that science is here following in like sort."—*The Record*.

" . . . und nach seinem Studium müssen wir das Aufsehen gerechtfertigt finden, das sein Erscheinen in den Ländern englischer Zunge erregt hat.

"Schon die Gesundheit der Auslegungsgrundsätze ist anzuerkennen, die er nebenbei an mehreren Stellen einschränkt."—EDUARD KÖNIG in *Die Reformation*.

"The last chapter Genesis and Science is the best discussion of its subject we have seen. The whole book is strengthening and even inspiring. Whoever would be posted should get this admirable work."—Dr. T. T. EATON in *The Western Recorder*.

"Wright is een helder denker, wat hij schrift loopt glad en is doorzichtig. . . ."  
"Juist dit nu zet aan zijn woord gezag bij. Hij scheept u niet met een raatje voor den vaak af, maar bij dringt diep in de voor hem liggende vraagstukken in, toont zich meester op het terrein dat hij betreedt."—Dr. A. KUYPER, in his Introduction to the Dutch edition.

---

Address,

BIBLE LEAGUE, 317 EAST 118th ST. NEW YORK CITY